

THE RADICAL.

SEPTEMBER, 1868.

PYTHAGORAS.

1. PORPHYRII PHILOSOPHI LIBER DE VITA PYTHAGORÆ, &c. Lucas Holstenius Latine vertit. Romæ, 1630.
2. JAMBlichus's LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS, or PYTHAGORIC LIFE, &c. Translated from the Greek by Thomas Taylor. London, 1818.
3. GESCHICHTE DER PYTHAGORISCHEN PHILOSOPHIE. Von Doct. Heinrich Ritter. Hamburg, 1826.
4. THE LIFE OF PYTHAGORAS, WITH HIS SYMBOLS AND GOLDEN VERSES, &c. By M. Dacier. Now done into English. London, 1707.

OF all the personages given us in history, there is hardly one who, however obscurely, yet more vitally, has left the impression of himself upon the ages than the Samian philosopher. His institution of the three hundred has long since passed away, broken up and trodden out of sight ; but in broader sense his institution still lives, working actively, with mission yet unfulfilled. His questions are still our questions ; the imperative, unanswered problems of to-day.

There is much difficulty in tracing this history. We have no writers contemporary, or nearly so : the name became quickly in a degree mythic ; and his biography, as it has come down to us, is full of the strangest extravagances.* At this distance, it is exceedingly difficult

* "The life of Pythagoras appears to us first in history through the medium of the modes of conception of the first century after Christ, in the same style, more or less, in which the life of Christ is narrated to us, upon a basis of common actuality, not in a poetic world, as a mixture of many wonderful and bold fables, — a hybrid of oriental and occidental conception." — *Hegel*.

to make the adjustments, and separate away, with any confidence, the fiction from the fact. The doctrines, moreover, were deeply concealed under a veil of symbolism, and hedged about long time by a sworn secrecy that kept them from the uninitiated. We have, therefore, to step cautiously here, not always certain of our ground, even with the oldest authorities; while, on the other hand, much that we have from the later writers, even the fanciful new Platonists, would, from its verisimilitude, lead us to believe it may be genuine.

Pythagoras was born, according to the best accounts, at Samos, in the earlier half of the sixth century before Christ.* His mother, Pythais, is related to have been a descendant of King Anceus, and a woman of surpassing beauty. His father, Mnesarchus, a merchant or a lapidary, apparently was of foreign extraction, a Pelasgic Tyrhenian, or else a Phœnician. Great tales are told of him in his origin and early life. He was fabled Godborn, the son of Apollo. An old Samian poet sings, —

“Pythais, of all Samians the most fair,
Jove-loved Pythagoras to Phœbus bare.”

He was the youngest of three sons. Mnesarchus, aware somewhat, it seems, of the gift that had been sent into his house, gave him the best opportunities of instruction then to be had, “committing him to Creophilus, to Pherecydes, and to almost all the prefects of the temple, as being blest with the fairest and most divine son that man ever had.” It is said that he visited Thales, Anaximander, Bias of Priene, &c.; but, upon this, little reliance is to be placed. Of Thales, the account is that he learned “above all things to husband his time;” a fine art, that one might well make the journey to Ionia to acquire. The father, it appears, died early, so that this boy was soon left to the care of himself.

Such was his wisdom and gravity, even in early life, that, if we may believe the relations, he drew and won all hearts. “To every one on whom he looked, he appeared worthy of admiration, insomuch that many averred he was the son of a deity. He, being thus confirmed, made himself more worthy of these advantages, adorning himself with devotions, with sciences, with excellent conversation, with constancy of mind, and with a sweet, inimitable serenity; never transported with anger, laughter, emulation, contention, or any other disorder; living

* According to Antilocheus — an old writer, about 400 years B. C. — in the second year of the 49th Olympiad, i. e., 582 B. C.

like some good genius come to converse in Samos. They called him by a proverb, "The Samian Comer," or "The fair-haired Samian."

At about eighteen years old, he commenced to travel ; for then the mystic East was the repository of learning, of sciences, and of thought, whither the wise men of Greece and of her colonies sought to go. He visited Phœnicia and Egypt, and, perhaps, still farther east ; but of this we know not certainly. In Egypt, he gained access to the priesthood, the temple rites, the arcana of their science, and the mysterious doctrines they kept deeply masked in symbolism. Perhaps they had little in content for him. Nevertheless he drew from them rich hints in reference to the work he was to attempt.

The record is that he spent many years in Egypt, — some say twenty-two ; after which, possibly having visited Babylon meanwhile, he returned to his native island, full of ideals of instruction and new styles of living, which he would fain here realize. But the reception was not what he hoped : his countrymen had little appreciation of his view, Polycrates was tyrant of the island, and altogether the field was too unpromising. He visited several states of Greece, Sparta among others, and also the island of Crete, and finally took up his abode in southeastern Italy, the region afterwards called *Magna Græcia*. Before this, however, he had attended upon his master, Pherecydes, in his last sickness, ministering with kindly office to his wants, closing his eyes, and giving him sepulture.

His arrival at Crotona attracted great attention, for it seems his fame was already wide. The old men and the young gathered to hear him. He was of impressive presence and very attractive address. He spoke to the young men, by request of the magistrates, twice ; to the boys who came flocking out of school to hear him ; to the senators ; and lastly to the women, for they also were drawn to listen. Jamblichus gives us professedly a report of the several speeches ; it may be, in part at least, genuine. To the young men, he exhorted deference to their elders, temperance, cultivation, a generous bearing towards all, "that they might hereafter never become enemies to their friends, but might soon become friends to their enemies ;" to the boys, studies and discipline and reverence ; to the senators, consideration, high character, excelling other men in nothing more than in justice, perfect equity to all ; to the women, simplicity in apparel, "that they present the gods with such things as they themselves make with their own hands," abstaining from all scandal, industry, and steady faithfulness.

His words were magic, and charmed them all. Porphyry, upon the

authority of Nicomachus, tells us that he gained two thousand by his first speech at Crotona. Certain it is that he rose quickly to great influence and power there. A general reformation was effected in the habits and manners of that effeminate people. He passed about among the neighboring states, working marked ameliorations. Peoples suffering from oppression he relieved, kindling anew the ambitions of freedom, and effecting modifications in their favor. There is suspicion that his leaning was strongly towards the aristocratic institutions. The power of his presence was great. Symichus, we are told, tyrant of the Centorupini, on hearing Pythagoras, laid down his rule, and divided his substance, — a part to his sister, and the balance to the citizens. He was a pacificator, "restored union and quiet in an infinite number of families that were torn by discord and dissension."

In all these states he seems to have formed — perhaps not immediately, but, at any rate, quite early — organizations, branches, probably, of the parent one at Crotona, auxiliary and co-operative with it. The Pythagorean order was thus spread through most of the cities in lower Italy and Sicily. It was a time of great quickening of thought, revival of interest in life on something like the true ideal. "All Italy," says Jamblichus, "was filled with thoughtful persons; and whereas before it was obscure, afterwards, by reason of Pythagoras, it was named Magna Græcia."

But it was chiefly at Crotona that he spent his time and devoted his labor. He abode here many years, — some say twenty; some, even forty. Here he maintained, to the end of life, his school, giving it his best personal attention. He had exoteric and esoteric instruction: the one for the beginners; the other for the advanced, the matured. The former, it is said, he always gave from behind a veil. Besides this, he held public discourses frequently, in which he addressed the different ages and classes, giving practical hints and admonitions to the young, to rulers and citizens, to parents, to husbands and wives, expounding their several relations and duties, emphasizing justice and virtue. What themes they were! and with what fullness and skill, what large suggestive wisdom, they were doubtless treated in these hands! *

* Speaking to children, he represented to them "that infancy being the age that was most agreeable to God, and which he is pleased to take into his more immediate protection, it is but reasonable that they should endeavor to preserve it undefiled, and to adorn it with all manner of virtues. They should never begin quarrels, and never seek for revenge. After the gods, they should honor and love, above all

He entered the family relation, and endeavored in his own person fittingly to discharge the offices of husband and father. Theano, his wife, said to have been a Cretan, was distinguished for her cultivation and noble character. He purchased the estate of one Alcæus, who had been an ambassador to Lacedæmon, where he dwelt, a model of economy and fine style of living. One of the biographers says he had five children, two sons and three daughters. One of the sons, Mnesarchus, died early; the other, Telauges, was the successor of his father in instruction.

Pythagoras did not escape the fate common to benefactors and reformers. He was thoroughly independent and uncompromising in his conduct of the institution. Porphyry says that he first of all men physiognomized; he formed his judgment of the candidate by observation of his temperament and features, his characteristic disposition and tendencies. He noted how he laughed and kept silence, what passions he was prone to, what society he liked, and what things most readily affected him. If he was rightly endowed, had the *diathesis*, the capacity, the turn for culture, for philosophy, and character, he was admitted; if not, promptly rejected. Rank could not command the entrance, money could not open it.

Jealousies arose, especially among those who were not of the admitted; a suspicion obtained that this society was of strongly aristocratic feature, and leaned always towards the establishment, for the senate and against the people;* and the apprehension was probably widely spread among all classes, that the brotherhood had political

others, their fathers and their mothers. There is nothing so great, nothing so venerable, as the quality of father."

He showed fathers that "all the disorders that reigned in their city were to be imputed to the ill-education they gave their children. There is nothing more ridiculous and foolish than what all fathers do. They take great care of their children in their infancy; but when those children enter into the most impetuous and boiling part of their life, which is the rendezvous of the most dangerous passions, they abandon them to themselves, and leave them sole masters of their own conduct. Yet then is the time they ought to redouble their cares, and to appoint their children such governors and masters as are capable of keeping them in awe, and to hinder them from running headlong to dash themselves to pieces against the rocks with which they are surrounded in this tempestuous ocean of life."

He cited to husbands the example of Ulysses, "who refused the immortality Calypso offered him on condition he would quit Penelope. And he said that no persons were so severely punished in hell as the husbands that had not lived well with their wives, and the wives that had not lived well with their husbands."

* These colonies of lower Italy were at this time tending to democracy. Ritter, *Geschichte der Pythag. Philos.* p. 46.

designs, and might, when opportunity offered, work revolution. One Cylon, a wealthy and influential nobleman, had applied for admission, and, upon trial, been refused. He took the rejection very angrily, and omitted no opportunity to stir up mischief. The secret dissatisfaction which had long existed was fanned into violence, a wild riot was raised, and the house in which the Pythagoreans were one day assembled, house of Milo, the wrestler, was set upon, fired, and the inmates hunted down and mostly put to death. Pythagoras seems not to have been there: but all the society were subjected to outlawry, not only in Crotona, but also in the other states; and the report is, that he, a fugitive, flying from place to place, finding no protection anywhere, perished not long after of starvation in the temple of the Muses at Metapontum. This is set at about 496 B. C. Cicero tells us that at Metapontum he was shown the grave where Pythagoras was said to be buried.

Violent commotions long time agitated Italy from this cause. There was manifest a determination and persistent attempt everywhere to exterminate or crush out this new and strange sect. Polybius tells us, in the second century before Christ, that, in Magna Græcia, the assembly places of the Pythagoreans were burned, and the foremost men in the states were put to death. It is likely that the persecutions were several times repeated. Under the pressure of the proscription, it would seem that the Pythagoreans fled in considerable numbers, about the time of Socrates, into Greece.

The fortunes of the order for the rest are involved in deep obscurity. How far it maintained itself as an organization at all, it is impossible to say.* There are several distinguished names, of about the time of Plato. Archytas of Tarentum was eminent for statesmanship as well as for learning, philosophy, and inventive skill in the arts. He is said to have had a philosophic school; and Plato, according to a wide-spread tradition, was his pupil. Occupying a high official place in his native city, his character was without a blemish: "he was gentle and generous, and he knew how to control his temper in the Pythagorean way." Clinias was his contemporary, and taught at Heraclea. He was highly celebrated among the ancients for his Pythagorean virtues. There are numerous anecdotes, some of them well attested, of his generous friendship, his great self-command, and

* "Recent researches connect these sectaries [the Essenes and Therapeutæ] with the traditions of Pythagoras." Coquerel, *First Historical Transformations of Christianity*.

his inflexible probity. The story of Damon and Phintias, as illustration of the fidelity of friendship, will readily come to mind. Philolaus, it appears, published a philosophical writing, of which we have now very valuable remains.* He was of about the time of Socrates, and must have been one of the ripest and most acute among the ancient thinkers.

The doctrine did not die out with the extinction of the order. It tinged strongly the current of the subsequent speculation; modified, however, and itself colored with Platonism and the mysticism that came in from the East after the conquests of Alexander. It appears prominently in Philo Judæus, Apollonius of Tyana, Nicomachus, &c., and especially in the Alexandrians. These men, the new Platonists, a most extraordinary dynasty of thinkers, were deeply impregnated with the spirit of Pythagoreanism, and in some of the points are its best expounders and representatives. Its felt presence and power was co-extensive with the duration of the ancient philosophy, and only in the last bloom of Grecian thought does it disappear visibly from history.

Of the *personnel* of this philosopher, we have little. He was styled "The fair-haired Samian," and described as singularly beautiful in boyhood, and of very fresh youthful look and great attractiveness of presence at the time he arrived at Crotona, aged fifty-six. "Tall in person, and graceful in speech and every gesture," says Porphyry. He was a man of grave, commanding aspect, and of singular self-poise, so that he was never seen to give sign of any grief, joy, or anger. It was a maxim with this school that one should go always armed with preparation for every issue, so as never to be overtaken by any disappointment or surprise. Such power of reproof he had, that a young man, it is related, having fallen under his severe censure, went and hanged himself. This excited in the teacher much reflection; and he concluded that the cure of vice, "like that of shameful diseases, ought always to be done in private." He was very frugal in his habits, plain and simple in style, and wore always a white and clean stole, and used white woolen blankets. He used a sparse vegetable diet, and Porphyry says he preserved his body in uniform perfect health. His skill was great in the healing art, and he is thought by some to have founded the first scientific school of medicine. His chief emphasis was laid upon the matter of diet, and the wisdom of this we are just beginning in modern science to learn.

* *Philolaos, des Pythagoreer's Lehren*, &c., von Böckh. Berlin, 1819.

"The most loving of friends," they say of him. "All things common with friends," and "Our friend is another self," were his maxims. "He conceived the end of friendship to be the making one of two." In this day, writes Jamblichus, we say of those who are intimately joined together in friendship, they are of the Pythagoreans. His friendship went out to humanity; for he claimed "a general friendship due to all men, even the wicked, and there were common duties, he said, between man and the very beasts."—"In regard to those with whom he had no intimacy, he never let slip any opportunity of doing them good, according to their merit and their condition, being persuaded that the chief virtue of men is to love one another," says one of the biographers.

He was held in profoundest veneration by those who became attached to him. His word was final authority for all. They forebore to pronounce his name. It was *he*, or *that man*, the one who revealed the sacred Tetractys. There were three grades of rational beings, they said,—God, man, and, between them, Pythagoras. Some declared him the Pythian, and others the Hyperborean Apollo; others said he was "one of the celestial deities, appearing at that time in a human shape for the benefit and direction of mortal life, that he might communicate the wholesome illumination of beatitude and philosophy to mortal nature,—than which a greater good can never come, nor shall ever come,—which is given by the gods through the means of this Pythagoras."

Such are in main the brief incidents preserved to us of this remarkable life. But his biography, the record of himself, which Pythagoras has left, is principally to be sought in his institution. It does not appear that he left any writing. Some few utterances, brief expressions professedly of his thought, have by various pens come down to us. These are our sole materials for forming an estimate of his place and weight in history.

The Pythagoric order or brotherhood was founded in the purpose of highest culture, the application of the human spirit religiously to the richest sources of improvement, and its growth and maturity in a noble and perfect manhood. Everything was grounded and saturated in religion. Here were the sanctions, the incitements, the sources of inspiration and power. That which is born of the spirit is spirit. Religion must begin, must hallow and baptize all. Pythagoras seems to have been a believer thoroughly in the doctrine of election. Not every one, as we have seen, could come into this discipline:

he selected carefully, admitting only those whom he thought apt and promising. "Not every wood," he was wont to say, "is fit to make a Mercury." He appears to have had singular sagacity in reading endowment and character. He gauged his man by scrutiny.

First, endowment, the finest parts attainable, the best gifts of nature ; then discipline, culture, the most rigorous, exacting, and complete, — this was his motto. The young man should learn self-containing and thought, refraining from speech, meditation, purification. Apuleius says, "He taught nothing to his disciples before silence. This, I say, was the first rudiment of wisdom, — to learn to meditate, and to unlearn to talk." Generally, it is said, he imposed a five-years' silence. The candidate must not speak, whatever the provocation. He must discipline and tame his passions, practice the utmost sobriety in regard to eating and every sensuous gratification. Viands of the most tempting food were set before them ; and then, ere they were partaken of, withdrawn from the table, and given to the servants. All their goods are said to have been thrown into common stock, and used for the benefit of the whole.

In the way of direct positive culture, the first method used was the study of mathematics. These sciences are grounded in the outer and the visible, and yet they rise into the sphere of the incorporeal. They move upon space and time ; and yet they are the highest distillation, so to speak, of the seen, — they approach the grandeur and strength of the everlasting. It seemed best therefore to Pythagoras to begin here, that the mind might quietly, and, as it were, insensibly, be withdrawn from the sense, and conducted to substance. Arithmetic and geometry appear to have been especially the subjects of study. Of arithmetic he was exceedingly fond, and he is reported to have said that he "conceived the ultimate good of man to consist in the most exact science of numbers." With these studies were coupled certain subtle speculations upon the relations of numbers and magnitude to ideas and the primal physical elements.

After mathematics came music, or rather it was a part of the mathematics, to be cultivated as an exact science. But there was a double power in it : it was good for discipline, good as a sacrament for elevation. It exalted the mind, put it in poise and *rapprochment*, and was every way a powerful redemptive influence. In every stage of his culture, Pythagoras made much of this. It was the rhythm of the world. In music, they say, consists the agreement of all things and aristocracy of the universe. The day was begun and ended with music. Censorinus says, "Pythagoras, that his mind might be *continually*

seasoned with Divinity, used, as they say, to sing before he went to sleep and as soon as he waked." Seneca says, "He composed the troubles of his soul by the harp." Porphyry, "He had morning exercises at his own house, composing his soul to the harp, and singing some pæans of Thales. He likewise sung some verses of Homer and Hesiod, whereby the mind seemed to be rendered more sedate." He was an inventor in this sphere, for it is alleged the world owes to him the musical scale and the monochord.

Here is a piece of his doctrine concerning disposition, which shows what in his view was one of the essential conditions to good culture. "He considered what disposition they were of as to being made gentle. This he called *κατάφρων*, *adjustment*; for he accounted roughness an enemy to his way of teaching, because it is attended by impatience, intemperance, anger, obtuseness, dishonor, and the like, but mildness and gentleness by their contraries."

With all this, the piety of the body was not neglected. Anointing and exercises were sedulously practiced; every method employed through which the most vigorous physical condition might be induced. Pythagoras seems to have had singularly clear perception of the intimate relation of physical to spiritual. The body is temple for the soul. It must be kept fitting as a shrine for this god. A sound mind only in sound body.

From these disciplines they were advanced to the more recondite sciences, the study of the absolute true and good, the Dialectics of Plato. (Hierocles defines Dialectics the inspection of Being, *των ὄντων*, reality.) Nature, the divine government, the soul, its relations, duties, destiny, the applications of the ideal principles to life, the use of symbols, — these all came in this higher course. Hegel says, "For the first time a teacher appeared in Greece, who taught science, had in view a totality, a new principle through the culture of intelligence, the disposition, and the will." In these, the young men received their tuition and apprenticeship for life. They obtained their qualifications for different departments of affairs; some for healing, some for governing, others for the divine art of instruction. It speaks to his credit that women were admitted to these studies, and full membership in the order. We have the names of several distinguished Pythagorean women. The religious element dominated everywhere: all things looked to character, to high virtue, and worship. Of the exact nature of these inculcations, we know little; but we have enough to indicate their general quality and tendency.

Aristotle says that he, first of any, discoursed of virtue, showing

thus that with him the ethical side of philosophy received treatment. Previous philosophy, certainly among the Greeks, had been occupied in speculations upon the primordial constituents of things, the first *ἄλη*, from which the universe was made. It was cold and unfruitful, to say nothing of the utter futility of the inquiry: it was void of significance for the moral element. Pythagoras saw that truth was moral; that life is a conflict overarched by an ideal, and to be translated into victory. It was not introspection; the subjective had not become protrusively prominent, as afterwards in the sophists: but it was healthful consciousness, the pulse of normal life that felt its own throb, and was awed in the thought of its purpose and grand destiny.

Here was the beginning of ethical science and practical culture; fresh in the youth of the world, and warm and pure with the impulse of the first, a virgin love. There was health and action, bounding life and joy, and yet sobriety and earnestness, a return within, and study to learn and to do. So this school stood apart, rising immeasurably superior to all that had gone before, superior in good degree to all that came after. For though there were, in subsequent history, regal minds, — Socrates and his successors, great expounders of the moral; Socrates himself a high confessor, living by his virtues imperishably in history; and Plato, a mind of unexampled range and richness, almost exhausting philosophy, — still we may probably say that there was none who united such discernment and scope with such essay after a broad realization. Pythagoras swept the universe with his gaze, dwelt in the azure heights, pierced the deepest abysses of speculation with his thought, and lived rejoicingly there; yet he rested also on the earth, and sought earnestly to make the great translation out of eternity into time. He studied and wrought, not for himself alone, but to bring word of redemption to the race; not merely to preach, but to lay out and to build.

The soul he defines "a self-moving number."* That is, it is a unit, an individual form, but of original self-moving power; a body, but ethereal spirit; finite, human, but transcendent, divine. Numbers, indeed, play a prominent and very curious part in the Pythagorean speculations. They seem to have been considered by them, according to the account of the ancients, symbolic and essential. Aristotle says, "They held things for numbers;" and again, "Things are by imitation of numbers." Much inquiry has been expended upon this point, but generally with very little result. Doubtless the idea was,

* Plato's definition is very like this, — "A self-acting energy."

that in entering the sphere of the visible, the historic, we come into the midst of individuation, of measure, and of number. Hence, in a comprehensive way, it might be said that number lies at the root of the world, and that, in our approach to essence and spirit, the nearest land we make is numbers. They are on the confines of the unseen and the infinite, are in a sense incorporeal and ethereal, and, therefore, exalting to the mind. They stand at the beginning of history and time, and are therefore primal. Number is present at the birth of the world. It is, in a sense, the eternally begotten son, the first-born of every creature. Number was also with Pythagoras, the name, such as mortals could give to the unnamable. God, he called, The One, the Number of Numbers, the sacred Monad.

The properties of numbers, moreover, are various and quite remarkable. Unity goes into alterity, and returns to unity. From two, all numbers unfold: two, united with one, is three; to itself, four; and so on. And one is two; that is, wherever there is individuation, there also is boundary, dual, the two. There is movement, rhythm in numbers; and they so symbolize the universe, the march of history, the music of time, the harmonies of creation. Monad, duad, triad, and the sacred Tetractys,—have we not here thesis, antithesis, synthesis, the epitome of the world,—God, creation, reconciliation, and union,—all flowing from the supreme monad, and all centering and lost at last in the one? "Ten is sacred," says Pythagoras; for here plurality returns to unity, number is complete in the many and the one. Within this, all is included; the reckonings of quantity henceforth but repeat themselves on a higher plane *ad infinitum*.

Numbers symbolize also in their relations of odd and even, perfect and imperfect, representing the two great facts that confront us everywhere in existence,—eternity, time; substance, form; essence, appearance; right, wrong; light, shade; infinite, finite; &c.* By numbers is order. Through them, we methodize the world, and reduce and possess it; we organize our life: and make it victory. "What is the wisest of all things?" said the school. "Number."—"Number," says Philolaus, "makes things knowable." They underlie music, and all the melodies are sounds in measure. The universe is a harmony, and its voice is unending song. "Astronomy," said Pythagoras, "is to the eye what music is to the ear."

* It was with reference to this relation of opposition, that the Pythagoreans laid down their ten categories as reported by Aristotle,—limit and the unbounded, unity and multiplicity, masculine and feminine, rest and motion, &c.

"The mind," he says, "comes by divine participation," *θεία μοίρα*, "proceeds from the soul of the universe." — "There is a soul come-meant through the whole nature of things, from which our souls are plucked." "She is immortal, because that from which she is taken is immortal, yet not a God, but the work of the eternal God," says Laertius. It was common with the school to call the soul a harmony, — i. e., by destiny, in its possibility ; or, as they expressed it, "it is built upon the model of unity."

The doctrine of immortality he held in a practical way, as embodying the sanctions of conduct. For all the metempsychosis was retributive, and designed to bear as incitement in the present. Such as spend life ill shall descend into beasts, the angry and malicious into serpents, the ravenous into wolves, the fraudulent into foxes, "thereby to receive punishment and right expiation." The pure are led to the highest — i. e., to the ethereal abodes. Ritter says that the sum of the Pythagorean doctrine of immortality was this, — that condition would accurately follow character. They did not attempt to define, but only to intimate by pictures and probable representations. Indeed, they did so always in dealing with the realm of the spiritual and the transcendent: they forbore to try to describe and define, but contented themselves with intimating by symbol, for they knew the impotence of thought to grasp the invisible. This view is well confirmed by the explications of Hierocles.

Pletho states that the Pythagoreans, as the Platonists after them, conceived the soul to be a substance, not wholly separate from all body, nor wholly inseparable ; but "partly separate, partly inseparable, separable potentially, but ever inseparable actually." This coincides well with the Fichtean idealism, which affirms the destiny of the soul, its home in the bosom of the Infinite, its final enfranchisement there in the transcending of all limitations, and the attainment of God, but declares this the unattainable ideal, the ultimate goal always to be neared and never to be reached. "This striving and inability is the impress of our destiny for eternity." Man is thus strangely dual, the medial link of finite and infinite, creature of time, the birth of yesterday, yet the heir of the forever, the sure possessor of the infinitude of God. He is a finite body, yet, in possibility, a limitless, infinite soul.

The two spheres so interpenetrate that we cannot sharply separate the one from the other. Eternity is colored and embodied by time ; time merges and is lost in eternity : but our freedom and attainment are as we subordinate and consume the lower in the higher. It is from faith to faith, worlds dissolve in worlds, and these in other and

higher forever. Swedenborg's spiral represents this ascent: the staircase bears upwards always, and the heights are lost in the skies. So the soul becomes ever more separate, but not quite absolved; passes up out of time and form, yet finds form with time in every new ascent still. It is the mortal putting on immortality, yet the immortality involved still in mortal. It is the man-god, and the god-man, the divine and the incarnation in each individual history. The soul knows because it is kin. Like is known only by like; and it is solely because we are of the same stuff of which the universe is made, because it, like ourselves, is built from number, i. e., order and idea, that we can apprehend it at all. This is stated with great clearness and force by Philolaus.

"God," says Pythagoras, "is One," the "universal spirit, diffused through all things and pervading all Nature." "The first, neither sensible nor passible, but invisible and intelligible." "The One is substance." "The One," says Philolaus, "is the beginning of all things, and One and God are not distinct." None can enter the inaccessible depths of this being; he is to be apprehended by the mind alone. Here is his symbolism: "In substance like Light, in nature like Truth." The aim of philosophy is to bathe the spirit in this presence, to steep and possess it with God, and lift it to the life divine. Hierocles defines it, "the purification and perfection of human life: purification from material irrationality and the mortal body; perfection from the recovery of its own excellent life, bringing it to the divine resemblance." Elsewhere he declares it is "that we may become all over wings to soar aloft to the divine Good."

Nature is image of the divine. The world was patterned after that infinite, and reflects it.* The universe, or, as Pythagoras first called it, the Cosmos, is the living symbol of God. Here is his shekinah and temple of majesty. The Pythagoreans held, as it seems, that the two are included and involved, are present in the one. Boundary and the unbounded, the full and the empty, the right and the left, good and bad, are potentially and indeed actively in the original being. But the evil is subordinate to the good, and the darkness to the light. Being is eternally *existent*, *Seyn* is *Daseyn*, or, as Hegel

* "Philolaus views the world as something like to the highest Being." Ritter, referring to Stobæus. p. 152.

"Nature forming the universe of all the different spheres diffused through the whole, it made as it were an image of the divine beauty, imparting variously to the copy the perfections of the original." — *Hierocles*.

put it, the absolute is *act*. So the ancients said, that, according to them, the world had an origin not in time, but only in human conception ; only in thought was it posterior to the one.

The physics of Pythagoras, as was all such speculation of that day, was in large part fanciful, having little relation to conviction ; yet there are marks here of a true discernment. The doctrine of Copernicus was anticipated, not clearly, yet really, by him. He was a poet, and saw with a poet's eye ; and his fine sense of the relations of fitness and completeness carried him to some of the discoveries of our modern science. Science laboriously explores, and attains ; he divined. The universe is order and beauty. It is a unity, and has the most perfect of all forms and motions, the spherical and the circular. All these planetary bodies are attuned in their distance and movement to music, and the nice ear might hear the harmonies of the spheres. Hegel says, " We must confess, that, down to our own day, science has hardly gone beyond Pythagoras in this regard. What with Kepler's laws, &c., we have not yet read the Harmonic of the skies, the beautiful necessity that underlies all. The reader of this fine secret is yet to come."

So, as ten is a complete number, there must, he deemed, be ten spheres, making, besides the nine visible to us, the tenth, Antichthon, or the sphere invisible, and opposite to the earth. The earth is globular, and there are antipodes. The formation of the universe begins from fire : fire is at the center, and fire surrounds all. The planets also are globular and inhabitable : the moon derives her light from the sun. Every star, too, is a world in the infinite ether. Spectrum analysis to-day, with its wondrous readings, verifies this conjecture, shows us that the far-removed fixed stars are made of the same minerals and gases as our earth — our sun also — is made. The dream of the poet, of the lone, meditating philosopher, becomes the reality of science.

Of this fine poetic temperament, he deals naturally in tropes and symbols. We have the merest fragments preserved to us from his words anywhere, but these are remembered. The sea is a tear-drop of Saturn, χρόνος, Time. The Pleiades, — harp of the muses. The planets, — the dogs of Proserpina. Brass, which rings on being struck, has a demon in it, and 't is his voice we hear. The eyes are the gates of the sun. "The sounds which the planets, fixed stars, and Antichthon utter, he called the nine Muses, and the union, symphony, and, as it were, mutual connection of them all, whereof, as being eternal and unbegotten, each is part and portion, Mnemosyne, mother of

the Muses. To the question, "What is time?" he is said to have answered, "It is the soul, life, of Uranus:" all things are steeped in Time. The Oath — i. e., the divine Oath — is the "Guardian of Eternity:" it is the very immutability of God.

Dealing in symbols, he couched much of his richest wisdom under that garb. Nothing in speech, probably, has given rise to wider and more strange and fanciful conjectures, than these so-called Pythagorean Symbols. They have continued, for most part, a sealed book through all the centuries; and yet there are hints, especially from the Alexandrians, that would lead us to see partially, at least, their significance. They are not more figurative and enigmatic, than naturally would be the speech of such a mind. We will try to read a few of them, using especially the helps which Jamblichus and Porphyry give.

"Leap not over a balance:" — transcend not justice; for the scales are widely emblematic.

"Stir not the fire with a sword:" irritate not with harsh words an angry man.

"Pluck not a crown:" violate not the laws; they are the crown of the state.

"When the storm rages, listen to the echo:" in time of great popular contention and violence, withdraw into solitude.

"Sit not upon a bushel:" live not irresolutely and idly.

"Sleep not at noon:" work while it is day.

"Assist a man in raising a burden, but not in laying it down:" let the help you render to others be towards accomplishment, self-assistance, to carry and not escape their burdens.

"Receive not a swallow into your house:" avoid garrulous persons, idlers, and bores.

"When you rise out of bed, fold the coverlet together, and deface the print." Starting on the career of the higher, the true soul life, make no provision for the sense: burn all the bridges behind you.

"Decline highways, and take the foot-path:" follow not the multitude, but choose with the sober and the wise.

"Eat not the heart or the brain:" consume not yourself with care or grief.

"Setting out on a journey, turn not back again; for the Furies will return with you." Making any change, leaving any stage of life, or going out of earthly existence even, look not longingly behind, seek not to return; for this will bring you only disappointment and sorrow: surrender cheerily to your destiny.

"Always put salt on the table." Always keep before you justice : salt was emblem of this.

"Keep the vinegar-cruet far from you." Repress the tart temper : never indulge the morbid or cynical spirit.

"Look not in a mirror by the light of a candle : " view not yourself in any glass that is false, and flatters.

"Sing only to the harp : " attune all your life and actions to the celestial harmonies.

"Offer libations to the gods, just to the ears of the cup : " let the gods be worshiped with music. Rather an awkward symbol, but of very good sense.

"One, two : " God, the world ; eternity, time ; substance, form and manifestation.

"Lay not the whole faggot on the fire : " be not prodigal of your strength ; husband and consume not your capital."

Others of these Symbols have so plain a face, that their purport is without difficulty seen.

"Grave not the image of God on a ring.

"Lay not hold on every one readily with your right hand.

"Withdraw before the flying flock ; " i. e., the giddy, rushing multitude.

"T is a crime to throw stones into the fountains.

"Stop not at the threshold.

"Sleep not upon a grave." Dwell not in the dead past : forget all that is behind, and go ever onward.

Others still are so deeply masked that they are not now easily understood. Almost every maxim of wisdom seems to have been couched under metaphor or symbol. With these people, the letter Y was symbolic. It represents, they said, human life. Here is the beginning,—all the paths are one ; and here is the parting of the ways,—how momentous the issue ! one path leading to conquest and life ; the other, to surrender, disappointment, and death. At the critical point, it is all valuable that one have the right master to beckon. Lactantius has it,—

"The Pythagoric letter, two ways spread,
Shows the two paths in which man's life is led.
The right-hand track to sacred virtue tends :
Though steep and rough at first, in rest it ends.
The other, broad and smooth ; but, from its crown,
On rocks the traveler is tumbled down.
He who to virtue by harsh toils aspires,

Subduing pains, worth and renown acquires :
 But who seeks slothful luxury, and flies
 The labor of great acts, dishonored dies."

Besides the Symbols, we have a few Pythagorean apothegms, preserved to us by Stobæus and others. Porphyry says he used often to say this to all his auditors, whether many or few : " We must avoid with our utmost endeavor, and amputate with fire and sword and by all other means, from the body, sickness ; from the soul, ignorance ; from the belly, luxury ; from a city, sedition ; from a family, discord ; from all things, excess."

" Think of it, that, while most men acknowledge wisdom to be the greatest good, but few earnestly seek to possess it.

" We ought to make choice of the best course of life, for habit will make it grateful to us. Wealth is a weak anchor. The body, preferences, honors, — all these are weak and powerless. What are then firm anchors ? Wisdom, magnanimity, fortitude, — these no tempest shakes. This is the law of God, — that virtue alone is solid : all else are but trifles.

" Temperance is the strength of the soul ; for it is the light of the soul, clear from passion.

" To serve passions is more grievous than to serve tyrants.

" No man is free who does not command himself.

" The labor of continence precedes and conditions all excellent things.

" It is better to die, than to cloud the soul by intemperance.

" Drunkenness is the apprenticeship of madness, the canker of the flower of the mind.

" It is not so hard to offend, as not to reprove a wrong-doer.

" What it were wrong to do, that be not even suspected of being capable to do.

" Promise nothing large, but do greatly.

" Count it a great part of a good education to be able to bear with the want of education in others.

" Every one is constituted by Heaven with capacity to know and reflect.

" It is not easy to go upon several paths of life at once.

" As well take bitterness from wormwood, as freedom from speech.

" One ought to seek a companion, children, friends, that will abide beyond death.

" Be silent, or say things better than silence.

" You may better throw a stone at random, than an idle word."

He must have been a model of condensation and point, as is indicated by the few things we have of him. Here is his maxim on this : "Comprehend not few things in many words, but many things in few words." So he defines *Φιλότης*, *ισότης*, Friendship, equality. Justice is a square number : virtue is a harmony ; so is all good, even God himself. All discourse should be practical ; lifting, enfranchising the hearer. "The discourse of that philosopher," he says, "is vain, through which no passion of a man is healed ; for, as there is no benefit of medicine if it expel not disease out of bodies, so neither of philosophy if it remove not vices from the mind."

Then we have the Golden Verses, as they are called, of Pythagoras, celebrated through all the ages ; written it is supposed by Lysis, or some later hand, but drawn apparently in good part from the master. They are the decalogue of the Pythagoreans, laying down the generic duties of life, hinting the incitements, and holding out the rewards. We are enjoined to respect ; and do honor to all, according to their place and worth : the immortal gods and heroes first ; then parents, friends, and our own nature. Through virtue, wisdom, and possession, by purgation and constant ascent, — we are to rise to our inheritance, our home, immensity, and the forever.

"Disrobed of flesh, thou'lt to free ether soar,
A deathless god, divine, mortal no more."

[To be Continued.]

THE SISTERS.

"Happy the house where the two sisters vary,
But most where Martha's reconciled to Mary."

Quarles's Emblems.

WITHIN my house a lovely guest
Was longed for ever :
She would not come with me to rest ;
And vain endeavor
I made to entice her, for my best
Could win her never.

Her sister still beset me sore
With direful clamor
Of troops about my well-barred door,
With blow and hammer,
And, entering, bustled through and o'er ;
And ancient glamour

She swept away like cobweb slight,
And galleries dreary ;
And twilight-halls of old delight,
Half dim, half gleamy,
She opened to the morning bright,
Breezy and streamy.

Flying, I shunned the intruder bold.
But she pursued me :
She routed me from each stronghold,
And roughly wooed me.
In vain I mourned my quiet old,
And loudly rued me.

The Sisters.

181

Weary, at last, of rout and strife,
Flight and defiance,
Worn out by plea and urging rife,
I sought alliance,
And set myself to school my life
Unto her science.

And now the house wears change on change ;
And, at her orders,
We busily reform and range,
Zealous marauders,
And ransack every nook, when, strange !
Within its borders

A door flew wide, unknown before, —
A staircase golden
Invited me to quick explore
Ways unbeholden,
And on that path I lost my sore
Heart-longing olden.

She sat in tower of outlook wide,
The guest vain-bidden !
She welcomed me unto her side :
I came unchidden,
To find a feature once denied,
A friend once hidden.

"Not sisters twain," she sang, "are we ;
Though aspect double
We show to him who reaps the lea
Or clears the stubble :
One soul twy-formed rules outlook free,
And clambering trouble.

"'Twas I laid siege your door to ope :
'Tis I receive you
With welcome passing all your hope,
With love retrieve you,
With heavenly vision from the scope
Of earth relieve you."

RELIGION AND REASON.

CONSIDERING the frequent occurrence of such terms as "religious philosophy" and "philosophical religion" in the literature of "Liberal Christianity," and the more explicit implication of Gerrit Smith's discourse on the "Religion of Reason," coincident with the eminent opinion of Dr. Hedge, as set forth in the title and subject-matter of his most taking book, I anticipate no popular welcome for my dissenting word ; and yet, though all the world dispute the novel assertion, there is no more of "reason in religion" than of religion in reason. Neither of these principles has any capacity for containing the other. Therefore they have no mutual affinity, and are, to say the least of their proposed combination, as indifferent to union as oil and water, which, however mixed by interfusion, will never coalesce as carbon and hydrogen in the former, or as oxygen and hydrogen in the latter, so as to be virtually lost in a new and homogeneous substance. Undoubtedly religion and reason are essentially incompoundable ; but this is not the *whole* truth of their association. They are not merely indifferent to union ; they are actively antagonistic, beside being opposed to each other in effect of their incompatibility as positive and negative principles, like heat and cold, or light and darkness, which cannot co-exist in the superlative degree of their respective consistence. Thus reason smothers religion, or religion reason, in proportion as either dominates the human mind ; and that for the same general cause wherefore heat excludes cold, or light dispels darkness. But, in reference to the issue of their association, reason is analogous to light and heat, and religion to cold and darkness : not as implying that the latter is a mere negation, however. It is, indeed, a compound of realities, but one of which reason is the ready solvent. We shall see, by and by, what the compound is, or what are its constituents, agreeably to my proposal in a former article. But at present I wish to say further, what is preliminary to a deeper insight of the subject, that as no body can be coincidently hot and cold, but only *warm*, as a subject of partial heat and partial cold, so no mind can be at once *most rational* and *most religious*, though it may be partly both ; that is, *semi-rational* and *semi-religious*. In reality, mankind are variously religious as well as rational : but while the

most religious are always the least rational, the most rational are always the least religious ; and hence I infer that a thoroughly rationalized mind must be quite devoid of religion. It is hopeful to observe, that this last character, though still rare, is less so than formerly : which indicates that man is a rational rather than "religious animal," or that the bent of human progress is *towards* rationality ; that reason is an *attribute*, and religion only an *accident*, of human nature. This warrants the conclusion, that reason, in its conflict with religion, is destined to triumph, even to the final extinction of its adversary ; for I cannot longer forbear to say that the annals of human progress are mainly characterized by one long, incessant struggle of these two irreconcilable antagonists, each unswervingly intent on mastering the other.

Universal history testifies to the various religious character of all human tribes from the earliest time of which it imports the memory of man : and paleontology not only confirms history in this particular, but enlarges its value to the same effect, by conducting the rational inquirer to still remoter ages towards the beginning of creation, *near*, if not quite *to*, the birthday of humanity ; thus almost justifying the inference, that religion is as old as human nature. The equal age of reason, or antiquity of its birth, is also established by its consubstantiality with the very existence of man as a rational being. But there was to be a disproportion in the career of these ideal competitors for human fame and favor, as predetermined by their unequal character. Religion, indeed, had the advantage of reason in the outset, as being full-grown, whereas reason was in its infancy. But this was born to *increase*, and that to *decrease* ; which opposition of destiny was worse for religion than its original advantage seemed to portend to reason. For the strength of religion was nothing but the weakness of its adversary ; and whereas reason was destined to grow, and come to power, religion was bound to *un-grow*, and come to naught. That is to say, man was, and is, to become more and more rational, and less and less religious, as the inevitable effect of human development, till, finally, religion will be discarded as a thing of darkness, in the day when reason shall be welcomed as the celestial light of the world.

Religion is indigenous to the soil of human ignorance. It flourishes only in those earlier stages of human development which antecede the epoch of rational maturity, when reason is accepted as the sun-light of supernal life. It is man's ignorance of his immortal destiny — of what awaits him in the impenetrable world to come — it is that, and nothing else, which makes room in the human mind for all those

false notions of heaven and hell, and of our dubious relation to either as contested domains of God and Devil, which religion has always subsisted upon. It is all for want of pansophical intelligence, of ability to solve the problem of creation, to comprehend the *not* "inscrutable purpose of Deity," as corresponding to the apprehensible *use* of nature, involving, as it does, the happy destiny of man, — ability to look through the mystery of temporal evil, to recognize God as the infinite giver, and nature as the method of his bounty, — it is only this intellectual deficiency which has retarded hitherto the development of moral science as the natural precursor of *righteousness*, whereby religion is yet to be forever superseded. More succinctly, it is only because of the primal weakness of *undeveloped* reason that religion has ever existed.

Lessing asks, and Mrs. Child repeats, as the motto of a chapter in her treatise on "The Progress of Religious Ideas," this question: "Why are we not willing to consider all religions merely as progressive steps, by which the human understanding has developed itself in every time and place, and will still develop itself in the future?" I answer, for three notable reasons:—

1. Because no form of religion *is* a step of progress, but rather a halt in the march of mind. When Luther saw, and sought to convince the Pope, that the sale of indulgences was an act of Belial, was the action of the latter, in rejecting the plea of his ecclesiastical subordinate, and finally in excommunicating the inceptive reformer, — was *that* a step of rational progress on the part of "his holiness," or a religious resistance of one which he was advised to take? And again, when this same religious reformer had barely escaped the net of papal power without breaking even the meshes of episcopacy, was *his* act of establishing another church in his own name, with King John of Saxony for its political head, invested with the same species of unbridled authority which he had vainly attempted to wrest from the See of Rome, — was this the step of progress which made him the champion of the Protestant Reformation? or was it a full stop in the way of its achievement? I call it the latter; and not only in that event, but in every ecclesiastical movement from that day to this, the only real obstacle to the rational spirit of the Reformation, the only thing that has retarded the development of the Protestant principle, that is, religious liberty (which means not merely liberty to worship God as one pleases, but perfect unconstraint of reason touching the whole matter of religion), — I say the only hinderance to the general grasp of this FREEDOM is the religion of Protestants themselves.

2. The human understanding never "develops itself" in religious forms, which only serve to betray its failures. Was it Paul's religion which developed his understanding, that, in the character of a Jew, "he was verily doing God service" by persecuting the followers of Jesus; and also his religion, as a Christian, which developed his later understanding that such conduct was grossly wrongful? Was it not, rather, the original defeat of his understanding in the former instance which determined the substance of his religion and conduct? and was it not the improvement of his understanding in the latter instance which prompted his denunciation of both? It was, indeed, a prominent failure of his understanding which led him to imagine, as a Jew, that God, if ever angry with wicked men, could be appeased by the bloody rites of the Levitical priesthood: and I dare say it was a no less glaring failure of his understanding, as a Christian, to mistake the sheer martyrdom of Jesus for the antitype of the Jewish altar; to esteem faith in *that* as better than righteousness; or to think it possible, by any means whatever, to save a sinner from the natural penalties of sin. What is here affirmed of Paul's religion, is predicable of religion in general. It has nothing to do with developing the human understanding, as I maintain by still another reason.

3. It is a trite observation, that the human understanding is developed by exercise of the intellectual faculties. One of my philosophic acquaintances, who is also a friend of progress, and a religious graduate of the old Calvinistic school of faith, thinks his wits have been greatly sharpened, for dealing with abstruse subjects, by means of prolonged efforts to reconcile the conflicting implications of his former creed. This he found impossible; but through the boldness of his rational temper, which enabled him to push inquiry to the core of all belief, he realized at last what was better than the object of his first intention, — deliverance from the insane assumption with which religious minds are generally possessed, that conflicting notions are consistent, or that belief itself is consubstantial, with any degree of intelligence. It was only in the process of getting rid of his religion, however, that he seems to have been rationally affected by it; and then only in a sinister way, the intellectual benefit of which is discoverable only in the vision of an optimist, who, expectant of "sermons in stones, and good in everything," sees nothing in difficulty but agency. Thus "the learned blacksmith" once let slip from his pen something to the effect that difficulties are winds of heaven to the spread canvas of earnest minds. But he seems to have overlooked the fact, that the winds of difficulty are always head-winds,

which blow us the wrong way. This is precisely the way religion acts towards reason. No doubt it makes work for the reasoning faculties when one tries to elude its sway, though not of the most profitable kind. If there were not legitimate work enough in the direct pursuit of knowledge, the argument for that which religion furnishes would be less ridiculous. Even the optimistic view which my philosophic friend is pleased to take of his own experience does not represent the best fortune that might have been his; for had he begun life with no religion, and with rational security against its inveiglements, the time he has devoted to the work of disentangling his mind, and recovering from its unnatural bias, if dedicated to the study of the natural sciences, would have been doubly profitable to him, as resulting in an equal development of his reasoning faculties, together with a store of practical information.

But how many examples might be cited of men born and nurtured to a similar predicament, with an equally restive wish to somehow escape from it, who have failed to extricate themselves, for want of the rational prestige of my intellectual friend! The rare confessions of such men as Barnes, Bushnell, and the Beechers, justify the inference that *all* the comparatively intellectual professors and inculcators of *faith* — faith in that whereof they lack due knowledge — find in their own experience the best of all illustrations of "The Conflict of Ages," as one of the Beecher family has obliquely styled the antagonistic workings of religion and reason. But the revelations of this book suffice to demonstrate that men may live, and to insinuate the opinion that thousands do, in perpetual bondage to a sentiment which they cannot explain. And why live thus, with immortal hope suspended by a hair of faith, when a very little reasoning would settle the question forever? Simply because religion does not allow its devotees to reason, except within the narrow bounds of belief; because the binding sentiment of faith, or the most essential part of religion itself, is an unconscionable *fear to test the reality of what one believes*, on pain of perdition. For how *can* it be tested without a preliminary doubt? and who would *dare* to doubt, when the terrible denunciation, "He that believeth not shall be damned," is ever ringing in the ears of true believers, as the very words of Christ, followed by those of his chief apostle, "He that doubteth is damned already"? No matter if these Scriptures have no such relation as is here presented, and mean something very wide from their popular acceptation, since religious fancy knows no bounds, and sets no bounds to fear. It is, in fact, no very trusty faith which makes this fear, the fear of rea-

son's *test of faith*, which is best accounted for by a lurking presentiment of final exposure ; a suppressed suspicion that the subject of belief is a thing of empty seeming.

There is another class of minds so completely dominated by religion as to be unconscious of its sway. There are men of talent, whose names are associated with works of literature and science, who reason well, and with no remarkable prejudice, on all subjects except those of a religious cast or bearing, concerning which they never reason soundly. This remark is susceptible of elucidation to any desirable extent by reference to Christian writers. Take, for instance, Bishop Lowth, whose treatise on "The Inspiration of the Old and New Testament" is of classic repute among theologians, and abettors of Biblical authority. It is some twenty-five years since I read this book ; but I shall never forget my religious disappointment on being apprised of the smallness of its rational merit. It happened in that transitional epoch of my religious experience, when my faith in the doctrine of "plenary inspiration" had been severely shaken, not by reading infidel books, but by a casual cognizance of imperfection in the Scriptures themselves, as the supervening result of that Berean searching of "the divine oracles" to which I had been prompted by pious motives. Yet I retained a strong affection for the sole casket of "revelation," and was in the attitude of looking about me for some unknown support of my languishing faith, when I gropingly found the book in question, the title of which seemed to promise food to my soul. None but those who have had a similar experience, after a like preparation of mind, will be able to appreciate the nature and effect of mine, on meeting, in the introductory pages of the work, a syllabus of the proposed disquisition, precisely as follows :—

"I think," writes the Prebendary of Winchester, "it will contribute much to the clearness and strength of the following discourse if I treat of the inspiration of the New-Testament writings in general in the first place ; for in this method we begin with what is most known and certain, and from thence proceed to explain what is more doubtful and obscure : and, *if the divine authority of the writings of the New Testament be once proved, that of the Old must follow* as a necessary consequence ; because the former gives testimony to the latter, and most of the arguments which prove the one may be easily applied to the other.

"I shall therefore, in the first place, give a definition of an inspired writing ; and then *prove* that the writings of the New Testament are inspired. An inspired writing I take to be a book that is written by

the incitation, direction, and assistance of God, and designed by him for the perpetual use of the church.

"The *proof* of the inspiration of the New-Testament writings I shall comprise in the following propositions:—

"I. *God designed* to provide a means for preserving the doctrine of Christ to the end of the world.

"II. This could not be done so well in any ordinary way, or human means, as by committing this doctrine to writing.

"III. It is more reasonable to suppose that God would make use of this way rather than any other, *because he made use of the same means before* for the instruction of the Jewish church.

"IV. He has actually made use of no other way, for conveying down the Christian doctrine, that can be assigned.

"V. The apostles themselves designed their writings for the perpetual use of the church, and looked upon them of equal authority in the Christian church, as the writings of the Old Testament were in the Jewish.

"VI. The age immediately after the apostles looked upon the writings of the New Testament as the standing rule of faith to the Christian church.

"I think the making-out of these propositions (some of which need very little proof) *will fully prove* the divine authority of the books contained in the canon of the New Testament; and, *when they are made out*, such consequences may be drawn from them as will silence most of the cavils and objections which the author of these letters * and some others have raised against the Scripture.

"I. The first proposition to be *proved* is this: *God designed to provide a means for preserving the doctrine of Christ to the end of the world.*

"*This proposition I think any Christian will take for granted*; and my design at present is not to dispute with infidels, but to lay down those principles upon which the divine authority of the Scriptures is built, the truth of Christianity being pre-supposed. . . . I say, therefore, that *no Christian can doubt* of the truth of this proposition; for *every Christian believes* the gospel to be the last and most perfect will of God which he intends to afford to the world: he believes that Christ will be with his church to the end of the world, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; that is, it shall never be so far weakened as that the profession of Christianity should cease, or

* Le Clerc's "Five Letters" on the same subject to which our author replies.

the church be perfectly deprived of the knowledge of saving truth. Nothing further being needful for illustrating this proposition, I proceed to the second proposition."

I have taken no other liberty with the above extract but to italicize certain portions for the reader's special attention. Here I dismiss Bishop Lowth, with the remark that none but religious writers, and they only in dealing with religious subjects, have ever been known to treat their readers so shabbily.

The famous writer of "The Conflict of Ages" has greatly multiplied examples of the distorting effect of religion upon the reasoning faculties of its devotees, especially those of the clerical order, who make a business of inculcating its fallacies. I select a few of Mr. Beecher's citations. Here is a scrap of the Presbyterian Dr. Woods:—

"It is no difficult task for *the subtlety of human reason* to urge very plausible arguments against the common doctrine of man's innate moral depravity. But, so far as a doctrine is taught us by inspired writers, it is our duty to hold it fast, however unable we may be to sustain it by *metaphysical reasoning*, or to remove the objections which *unsanctified philosophy* may set in array against it. It is a doctrine which is not to be brought for trial to the bar of human reason. Mere *natural reason*, mere philosophical or metaphysical sagacity, transcends its just bounds, and commits a heinous sacrilege, when it attacks this primary article of our faith, and labors to distort it, to undermine it, or to expose its truth or its importance to distrust."

And again the same Dr. Woods gives us a taste of what he would call "sanctified" philosophy, and illustrates the religious use of a reason *not* "merely natural," thus:—

"Men *begin to exist* out of communion with God. This is the fact which no sophistry can get out of the Bible, or the history of the world. Paul tells us why it is. It is because we fell in Adam: it is for the offense of *one man* that *all thus die*. The covenant being formed with Adam, not only for himself, but also for his posterity,—in other words, Adam having been placed on trial, not for himself only, but also for the race,—his act was, in virtue of this relation, *regarded as our act*. God withdrew from us, as he did from him: in consequence of this withdrawal, we begin to exist in moral darkness, destitute of a disposition to delight in God, and prone to delight in ourselves and the world. The sin of Adam, therefore, ruined us; it was the ground of the withdrawing of the divine favor from the whole race; and the intervention of the Son of God, for our salvation, is an act of pure, sovereign, and wonderful grace."

In the same vein of unreason writes also Pascal :—

“What can be more contrary to the rules of *our wretched justice*, than to damn eternally an infant, incapable of volition, for an offence in which he seems to have had no share, and which was committed six thousand years before he was born? Certainly nothing shocks us more rudely than this doctrine; and yet without this mystery, the most incomprehensible of all, we are incomprehensible to ourselves.”

I am tired of copying such nonsense; but this specimen of sanctified reasoning, by one Abelard, is not to be slighted :—

“Would it not be deemed the summit of injustice among men, if any one should cast an innocent son, for the sin of a father, into those flames, even if they endured but a short time? How much more so if eternal! Truly I confess this would be unjust in men, because they are forbidden to avenge even their own injuries. But it is not so in God, who says, ‘Vengeance is mine,—I will repay; and again, in another place, ‘I will kill, and I will make alive.’ For God commits no injustice towards his creature in whatever way he treats him; whether he assigns him to punishment or to life.”

These citations are sufficiently suggestive of the general tendency of religion to smother reason, or so to befog the understanding, and invert the order of reasoning, as to thwart the use of its faculties; and this tendency is so insinuating, and gains ascendancy in so many ways, that I cannot advert to them all. Of those not as yet hinted at, one is too important to pass unnoticed; and that is, the embarrassing effect of faith upon the agents of scientific research. We recollect, with unfeigned disgust, the priestly abuse of Galileo, and the Catholic rejection of the precious astronomic truth which he only sought permission to promulgate; but we are hardly so sensible of an equal fatuity of the ecclesiastic powers of to-day. It is not *science* that religionists hate, but only the bugbear of its tendency to nullify “revelation.” The church has become reconciled to telescopic views of the universe, only after learning that the Bible was never meant to teach astronomy. But even Hitchcock could not see that it was not meant to teach geology; and no Christian scientist ever will see that it does not undertake to teach cosmogony. Hence their seeming carelessness, or rather surly unwillingness, to be wise above what is sacredly written of the world’s genesis. I know of no other explication of the fact that every university in Christendom ignores the science of cosmical development, as set forth by Darwin and others; that the elements thereof are carefully excluded from school-

books of every grade, while the same are interlarded with the crude thoughts of Moses about a miraculous creation ; that hardly anybody that "enjoys religion" cares to penetrate the sacred mystery in which "revelation" wraps up nature. This is not because religious people *love* darkness rather than light, but because they *fear* nothing so much as an unscriptural truth. Even Newton, the advent of whose exploring genius so enlightened the scientific world that Pope could say of him, with no hyperbole in the nice conceit, —

"The planetary orbs lay hid in night :
God said, 'Let Newton be,' and all was light," —

Even that great astronomer knew nothing about cosmogony ; seems never to have had a thought of how the world was born, other than those of the Biblical mythology. Yet he must have had : so grand a thinker must have sometimes dreamed of what he did not utter. And why? Because he had religion ; or, more pertinently, religion had *him*. This is why he who taught us how to weigh the planets, himself could not weigh a word of Moses.

But it is time to put an end to these reflections, and to consider their rational implication with regard to the use which is to be made of that. To this end, I present the following *resumé* of the doctrine which I have aimed to establish by the foregoing exposition : —

1. That religion and reason are antagonistic to each other.
2. That, as attributes of human nature, reason is essential, and religion accidental ; the latter being incidental to the temporal development of the former.
3. That religion is semi-fallacious, a fabrication of fancy concerning the unfathomed destiny of man ; being born of, and subsisting upon, the primal weakness of reason.
4. That the earliest generations of mankind were the least rational, and the most religious ; and that every step of human progress is towards the reverse of this predicament ; so that man, when he shall have come to rational maturity, will have no religion.
5. That perfect reason, as the predicate of rational maturity, is an inevitable product of human progress ; whereas religion is to be outgrown.

These several propositions are so logically consistent as one statement of truth, the latter three being inferential of the former two, and these are so well sustained by previous reasoning, that I can think of but one possible hinderance to their ready acceptance by the most enlightened of my readers ; and that is, the popular proneness

to mix in theory religious manners with morals. There is nothing, to commend religion to a free-thinker, but the notion of some virtue in it. But virtue is founded in reason, and religion in *un-reason*; and, since the two are antagonistic, it is plain at least that virtue is not essential to religion, nor religion to virtue. As to this matter, however, suffice it to say here, that, having taken special pains in a former article to discriminate the distinctive significance of the two words, I am not to be understood, here or elsewhere, as rejecting anything in the name of *religion* which is (properly) comprehended by the word *righteousness*. To this annotation I subjoin the remark that the third and fourth of the consecutive propositions just announced, which at present represent only logical implications of the first and second, are independently demonstrable; and their demonstration is only deferred for the double reason that to undertake it now would involve other topics than those embraced by the general subject of the present writing, and make this article too lengthy for the medium of its publication.

And now, as to the practical use of the doctrine here set forth: *that* is available only to such as are apt to conceive it; which is most probable of those two emergent classes of religious graduates who are rallying respectively in the name of "Radicals" and "Liberal Christians." For these, therefore, I have a distinctive word of suggestion.

1. The Unitarian mind, though its ecclesiastical body is small among Protestant sects, ought to be greatly conscious of its dignity as representing the most exalted form of Christianity; the summit of religious *progress*, as it were, towards which all the other sects of Christendom are unconsciously marching out of darkness into comparative light. At the same time, it ought not to be oblivious of the equally notable fact, of which it is partially and fitfully sensible, that this exalted position is due to its own comparative rationality; that its progress hitherto, in so far as it is to be considered Christian or *religious*, has been wholly negative, and positive only in proportion as it is to be considered *rational*. It ought to be aware also that its ambition to be "liberal" is to be realized only by the fullest welcome of REASON as the proper guide of faith; as Bishop Butler's "candle of the Lord within us," whose light on the pathway of ecclesiastical hope, in Scripture and in conscience, is essential to that "revelation" of divine will, and direction of human wish, which the church is vainly seeking in the name of religion. It ought to know that just in proportion as it covets the old badges of implicit belief, just in pro-

portion to its emulation of Orthodoxy, and its endeavor to be *Christian* in the obstinately mystical sense of this word, just so far it must fail of being thoroughly rational and "liberal." So much all Unitarians ought to know, not to exemplify the folly of Baal's ancient worshipers. Let them hear the voice of the new Elijah, and halt no longer between two opinions.

2. All the agents of the radical movement should understand that the providential purpose of its inauguration has no concern with religion, further than is needful to a popular discovery of its illusive consistence. The cause of radicalism is the new age of reason just dawning on humanity. It denotes an epoch in human development. That department of its operations which seems to seek and merit some religious designation represents a change in the direction of man's spiritual aspirations, as well as the awakening of new impulses, in effect of a rational insight of his immortal destiny, as "*the well-beloved son of God*," instead of the bastard for whose uncertain redemption a miraculous personage of that appellation has been falsely said to have died. What all true radicals have to do in this emergency, is to help others, less fortunate than they, to *see this truth*. And this is to be effected, not by ridiculing anybody's devotion, or attacking the idols of any worshipping sect, but by encouraging, in all practical ways, the development of *reason*, by insinuating science, wooing the spirit of inquiry, and helping *religious people especially* to think for themselves. In short, the great business of the radical movement is to inculcate the philosophy of universal being, preparatory to raising the standard of UNIVERSAL RIGHTEOUSNESS as the only predicament of happy being here and hereafter.

GEORGE STEARNS.

EGOITY.

I CALL up a question, supposed to be settled by most men, but considered anxiously by the sceptical few. "Is there a future life to man?" In one sense of this question, there can be no other than an affirmative answer. No person doubts, that, after his death, there will still be on this planet, and probably elsewhere, beings of nature, form, and mind, like the present race of men; and that these will be continued, by successive deaths and births, so long as the world shall last: the universe is not to be an eternal, unconscious blank, from which the whole of its intelligent inhabitants is swept in destruction. The question before us is, Will any one of these future beings be identical with any one of the present? and this question I am constrained by reason to answer in the negative.

Each person, now living, has a consciousness of existence, and a conviction that he is himself, and distinct from all others, whose existence and consciousness he only infers, from the testimony of his senses. It is this conception that I call "egoity." There has been the same consciousness of distinct existence lost by death, and again generated, in each of every human being successively, since the time of Adam; and yet no one has had the memory of the consciousness of any person who preceded him: and as human bodies are confessedly decomposed and lost in death; and as we have the full belief, that all consciousness, and all mental operations, cease in these bodies when they cease to breathe, — we cannot understand how the same consciousness, the same imagination, and the same memory, of past transactions, which so much depended on former corporeal organization, can exist in another body, entirely new, and perhaps superior.

I am aware that this difficulty is confessed to be a mystery, and I proceed to examine the hypothesis by which it is attempted to be solved. It is supposed, there is united to each human person another substantial being, which is yet distinct and different in nature from the elements of the body, and capable of existing without them; which, though consciously acted upon by the senses, and organization of the body, is unaffected by such action; is imperceptible to human senses; and thus, when the body dies, departs from it unseen: its

faculties, before confined, are then unfolded ; and it is capable of all the action (perhaps with superior power) that the body could assert, when united to it. This is called the "immortality of the soul," and has obtained almost universal credence. This metamorphosis is by some supposed to be immediate upon death, and, by others, supposed to be effected, through a season of unconscious existence, in a state of chrysalis.

General as this hypothesis is, it is in itself so nearly incredible, that it requires reliable proof ; and the assertion I now make, is, that there is not the slightest evidence for it. No sensation, intuition, or other indication of any such independent substance, is perceived in the body or mind : for all the mental phenomena noticed, as consciousness, judgment, memory, imagination, &c., some of which are often ascribed to this "soul," are but insubstantial operations of the material organization of the brain, perceived only when that organization is acted upon by the senses, and ceasing when that sensuous action ceases ; and, as to its immortality, nothing is ever seen to depart from any human body at the hour of death, nor any power exerted outside of it ; and the idea of a portion of space, supposed to be self-conscious, while devoid of solidity, gravitation, light, and impenetrability, is only the supposed conception of a conscious nothing, a plain absurdity. A substance may be of entirely different nature from the substance of a human body, and be called by the name "spirit," and such may be conceived to be the case with the Deity or angels ; but as the substance of the human body consists only of its sensible qualities, so no departure from it can be substantial without them.

But it is said, though the doctrine of the immortality of the soul may be inconceivable to us, still, as it is a doctrine of Christianity, all who rely on the infallibility of the New Testament must accept the fact, though its meaning may not be understood. Here is a great error : it is not a doctrine of Christianity ; it is nowhere mentioned in the New Testament, or recognized by Christ or his apostles, — a most extraordinary circumstance, if so important a doctrine had been thought by them to be true ; it was unknown to the Jews, but, being generally believed by the heathen, was introduced into ecclesiastical Christianity, with the early corruptions of the Platonic fathers. Immortality is indeed abundantly taught in the Scriptures ; but is always immortality of a renewed being in a future world, never immortality neutralizing death in the present.

But resurrection from the dead is certainly taught by Jesus ; and

he might have been deputed to teach that doctrine, and his authority to do so might have been confirmed by miracles; but it is clear that this doctrine was emphatically urged by him for the moral purification of all who should believe in his mission, as he expressly made it conditional on character in this life; and he has accordingly represented it as a scene of trial, judgment, and retribution, — which implies identity of being, and continued remembrance of the present life. But this annunciation would have the same influence on present human virtue, whether to be experienced hereafter or not. We have therefore no certain assurance from it, that there will ever be such resurrection; and, as it is inconceivable, it becomes incredible. Unhappily, with teachers of religion, while the uncertain revelations of futurity are rigidly insisted on as essentials of salvation, the more certain and beneficial instructions of morality are disregarded. The appalling declarations of future judgment, made by Jesus, are deeply impressed, on peril of eternal ruin; but his reproofs of corrupting avarice and inhuman war are regarded with indifference.

There is another consideration, which, while it gives confirmation to the belief of the immortality of the human race, throws rational doubt on that of the individual. Every person who will take a mental survey of the history of the world, from its earliest known period, will discern, through all its fluctuations, a constant gradual improvement. We have only to glance at its geological revolutions, in which, through vast ages, successive strata of the earth have been occupied by ever higher and higher forms of vegetable and animal creations: and in the records of man, from his earliest appearance, we learn his advance, from savage ferocity, through degrading superstitions, to more intelligent conflicts and tyrannies; these followed by the regulations of imperfect law, and acquisition of comforts, till he comes to the present age, in the blaze of scientific discoveries and commercial intercourse; and, in this progress, we discern a divine aim, to exalt the world, in future generations, to the highest possible state of purity and perfection.

But why is such an amelioration needed, or how does it compensate for so long and slow a process of ages, if every generation of men successively pass from the world, after a few years of various enjoyment and sorrow, into a new and happier condition, without any participation in the advancement that succeeds their deaths? Why repair and add to a dwelling you are about to quit? But if we suppose that an egoity of consciousness always exists in some one of successive future human beings, although there should be no memory

of the past, the man born next after the deluge would successively and ultimately enjoy all the blessings of an improving world, fully as if born into a new being centuries to come ; the geometrical, unimaginable multiplication of intelligent beings will be prevented ; the order of nature preserved ; and miraculous, renovating creation avoided. The ideal heaven of theology would indeed never be reached ; but, as this heaven is only ideal, this will be no real loss. This highly improved planet is the true heaven of men ; perpetual egoity is the true everlasting life ; identity of a future being with the present is an impossibility ; identity of human nature with angelic, a chimera of fancy.

J. B. P.

 L I N E S .

LET us not live as many do,
 Who, scorning godly reason,
 Cleave unto creeds that pride calls true,
 But which true love proves treason.

Let us not break our faith in man
 By lessening friendship's uses ;
 Nor let us contradict God's plan,
 Upholding sin's abuses.

Let us not live by outward sign,
 And let our sense impeach us ;
 Let us not have the power divine
 Fail in its strength to teach us.

Let us not follow crowds for fame,
 And lose the honor lowly,
 Nor deem that centuries of shame
 Have left the Right less holy.

A. W. BELLAW.

PRO-SPIRITUALISM.

MODERN Spiritualism addresses itself emphatically to the senses, differing fundamentally from all other forms of religion in that respect, unless Roman Christianity be an exception. That, to be sure, addresses the senses, but only to the ignorant; the intelligent perceive significations underlying the symbols; but then the significations, becoming definite in such minds, are evangelical, — which means unscientific, hence anti-rational. So, I repeat, it differs from all other forms of religion on that point. Is it in conflict or in harmony with that inner sense or soul deep which no mental plummet has ever yet sounded; which is marked on the oldest charts “no bottom;” and which, with all the additions of later or modern explorers, are still marked “no bottom”? Perhaps here is not the time or place to answer that question, only to think of it.

Of all ages, this is the inductive or practical age; and we are a people marked with inductive or practical tendencies. Dealing with facts is always popular, and has on its side the multitude, who observe rather than think, and of course are not inclined to listen to the more subtle teachings of the *prophets*, or those who live before their time; that is, those who reason from intuitions or principles downward or outward to facts. Henry Thomas Buckle says, “Actions, facts, external manifestations of every kind, often triumph for a while; but it is the progress of ideas which ultimately determines the progress of the world.” I think few will dispute what is stated here on this point: and it reduces itself to this; viz., the observers are many, and the thinkers are few, and ultimately the thinkers rule the world.

Modern Spiritualism, its facts or phenomena, is here, in triumph, “for a while,” if you choose. It may be here by virtue of the demand which the age has for facts, as a taste for dreams increases the crop of dreamers. It may be here to meet a want once supplied by faith; that faith which science and reason (that is, rationalism) have killed. The logic of deduction from established principles, so called, is adverse to the claims of modern Spiritualism. The logic of induction has had no place in this connection. There have been heretofore no facts. The dead men *were* dead, and induction is inapplicable to and has no connection with theology: *that* is born of revelation, assumed.

Therefore just as the logic of theology was adverse to the fact that the earth was a sphere, so is theology and all deductions from preconceived notions, however liberal in statement, adverse to the claim made by modern Spiritualism. The world demonstrated to be a sphere, there was revolution in the world of mind as well as in the world of matter. Demonstrate as clearly this fact, — or, rather, the claim based on the fact, — then behold another revolution. That point no one will dispute. But will it be demonstrated? What are the probabilities? The minds that reason from established principles (or notions true or false), or, to be more definite, a man who has the idea that heaven is more or less a church gathering, where dignity and greatness have no light dressing of frivolity, but the redeemed "are as the angels in heaven," all human weaknesses having been left in the grave, and the free spirit, or the souls of men, all great, good, and perfect, — in a word, a sort of rationalized heaven with some or all the ancient evangelical features, — such will answer, and, as far as heard from, do, that the fact will *not* be demonstrated as a truth, and never ought to be: it would be a libel upon a sensible conception of heaven, the dwelling-place of the Infinite, and the resting-place for the weary pilgrims of earth.

I am aware I have no authority for reconstructing any one's notion of heaven or its inhabitants, the abode either of the blest or the disembodied: but, laying aside the "Planchette" authority, I have as much as any one; and that, expressed by a symbol, is o. That means, on this subject, assuming, for the moment, it wholly devoid of fact, and wholly in the domain of faith, that the thinker or the philosopher has no right to assume what the facts or the phenomena ought to be from logical inferences, and, if antagonistic to his idea, reject on the ground of absurdity or triviality, — in other words, judge before a hearing. We came from monkeys, says Charles Darwin. We may go back at death to first principles, or be monkeys again. No inference can possibly make us fear such a destiny: but no one can say it is not so; and, if investigations should demonstrate that fact, it is scientific to follow where the facts lead, and it is unscientific and irrationalistic to reject phenomena, trivial or silly, which, existing, exist for some purpose, no matter what. We shall never know till we study it; and, in this connection, no matter the consequences to our hopes, our expectations, or our vanity. "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise," may be evangelical: it is by no means rational.

I know of no subject so deserving of careful, tender, and critical attention, as this one, whether in reference to its peculiar associations

with our destiny, or in reference to its wide-spreading influence as manifested in the multitude of its adherents. In a spirit of inquiry then, not of dogmatism, let us look at the subject. I do so, hoping it to be true; but not prejudiced, I think, by that hope. From a great multitude of facts, let me select one, for a starting-point, from my own experience. I do not qualify the word: I mean fact. This detailed statement will be an episode in the argument, but it seems to be required as an aid or setting to the points I have in view. Here is the statement:—

Ellen was for many years a domestic in our family. Ann was a wet-nurse for our baby. Both were Irish and Catholics. Ellen was rather old, unmarried, steady, and faithful. Ann, the nurse, was a widow of about twenty; ignorant, careless, and lively. There had been, in the month or two that they had lived together with us, several quarrels between them; one quite serious, where it was necessary for me to interfere. Ann was accused by Ellen of pulling the kitchen-table from her with her foot while kneading bread on it; had done it, or similar pranks, many times. Ann said she did not, and Ellen said she did; which led to a "rolling-pin" fight. And, without going into details too minutely, I had got to part with a healthy nurse or a faithful girl. A nurse, being a mother by proxy for the time, is mistress in the house. One cannot see his baby suffer. So we make sacrifices, "hang our harps upon the willows when we remember Zion," and pray for the weaning-time and freedom. Had it not been for her office, Ann would have been turned away without question, and at once. As it was, I conciliated Ellen, and compelled a truce. In a short time, the same thing occurred up-stairs. The light-stand seemed to be pulled away towards Ann. She was scolded by the mistress. Ann denied it, and in the plain evidence of the fact; for, while scolding, the table jumped. The secret was out: Ann was a medium. This girl did not know what "medium" signified; and had never heard of the word Spiritualism, and did not know its meaning or its associations. We visited the kitchen. The table moved a foot towards her, untouched. The whole matter was explained. There had been no lies told. As stated, we would have discharged, as a disturber and a liar, on positive evidence, and injured, an innocent girl; in my ignorance, would have done an injustice. May not incarnated wisdom, higher up, be doing injustice now, to some for their honest conclusions on this subject, that a more careful investigation might at least modify? This matter was lengthily and critically examined under very favorable circumstances. The details are hardly needed

here for my purpose. Ann's husband and father assumed to be the operators at the spirit end of the line: and, through her, I got communications from many persons and relatives; often statements in reference to furniture and pictures they once owned, given for tests, the details of which this chance girl could know nothing of; many unknown to myself, that inquiry proved to be true. After going to confession, she refused to *sit* any more; said her priest forbade it. He told her the spirit *was* her father, &c.; but she must not sit any more. It was wicked, and we were Protestants. The priest then believed in the fact, it seemed. The explanation of his objection did not seem to be very intelligible or reasonable; but I make allowances for the medium, in mundane matters, just as I would one in spiritual. Persuasion overcame her objections: I asked her if she still loved her father and husband (who were still Catholics on the other side). She did, and she believed with the priest, that it was her father and her husband as the communications claimed. "Then," said I, "suppose we ask them?" If Ann had any inclination in the matter, it was that they would say, "Mind the priest." Their reply was, "You do perfectly right to sit; and we like it too, and we love you."

As the details of this or any of the phenomena is not the object of this communication, I will leave what I have inserted here as an episode, and say that this matter seems determined to be heard, and will not down at any one's bidding. The scientific journals hitting the right point, say, What is Planchette? I do not expect science, as science, to answer. Science deals with matter. When a great question is asked seriously, in the course of time the interpreter will be born. He is as likely to be a carpenter's son as a Gamaliel; rather more so, if any conclusions for the future can be gathered from past experience: the author of "Ecce Homo" says the world is grandly debtor to lowly cradles, which is a truth.

An anti-Spiritualist in the "Atlantic Monthly" has been in the front, and seen the phenomena. Now, there is something in it, it has come to me, says he. Professors explain it. They still neglect the unclean thing, saying to this writer, "Watch it carefully: you are deceived." He is snubbed; *he*, who is religious and respectable, not one of those Spiritualists. He forgets it is not the man that makes the matter worthy of notice: it is the matter that degrades the man, as yet. This late writer tells his story outside of the ring of fools. No more a fact for that; but it shows extension, pressing for expression on the line of least resistance. It has got beyond the deluded; and, as the volume expands, the fracture extends through this late

and tougher material. If this subject is mythical, we shall know it in the next age if not in this. In the mean time, let us soberly treat it. Spiritualism is the only form of religion that America has yet produced ; [please not suggest Mormonism in this connection, — that *de-facto* is not confined to Utah or America] ; and, aside from its supermundane claims, is, as to its ethics, just what a free people, who, in flowering out, produced the Declaration of Independence, might suppose to develop as a religion. It is essentially *independence, liberty, and progress*, in perfect harmony with the last circle of the Protestant wave, — Parkerism, or free religion ; just what the "Radical" represents all but the one fact, that disembodied Theodore Parker not only lives, but speaks to and through mortals.

It is not my purpose to make converts to that fact : for I am in full fellowship with the radical or free-religious movement, as well as having Spiritualistic notions ; while on this point, let me say, that T. L. Harris, A. J. Davis, H. Tuttle, and others, have given brave and great thoughts, obtained, I am sure, by some royal road to knowledge, still I admit that Shakespeare, Parker, Milton, or Franklin, have never, through mortal sources, uttered a communication that they would willingly have fathered if they had been in the form. Shall *we* then, and brave John Weiss, lose the hope of a proper heaven for the thin thought that may come or purport to come from him when he has passed on ? All saints help us ! Here is an interesting phenomena. Not a cheat, not a delusion, in the external fact, addressing itself to the highest in man's nature, because it speaks to his religious nature. Now were it an error, more or less, remembering that the perfect smile belongs to God alone, and also the perfect truth, if it made men better and happier, and injured no one, we might afford to be tender even to an error, and almost regret its exodus, as some do departing Faith. I have sometimes thought, in our progress, having lost the faith that the fathers had, that smoothed the pathway to the grave, with the philosophy of reason for its substitute, one would be justified in saying with Coleridge : —

" Oh ! never rudely will I blame his faith
In the might of stars and angels :
This visible nature and this common world
Is all too narrow."

Humanity grows ; and in this age of facts, when everything is met and handled in the inductive or analytic spirit, which is the logical condition of human progress, I am led to ask what the heart-tendrils will reach hold of and entwine to support this human vine ? I have

the many in my mind, not the richly endowed few, wealth of thought. Can any one believe that God has left us without a witness, not of himself, that evidence is everywhere, but of his justice? It is nowhere in material philosophy. I go, says Faith; but I will send the Comforter, and it will teach you all things. It must needs be that I, Faith, go. If I go not, the Comforter will not come. In the midst of rationalism, I am looking for what it has not in itself, — the Comforter. Has God left us without the witness? Mr. Weiss has it. He feels *his* immortality. That satisfies him: he needs no tables to tip for him. He gave Theodore Parker the witness. He was sure of the *other* world: this was the one he doubted. But why give to Weiss and Frothingham and Parker and Bartol, and not the many like this writer? Must the many take it on trust? Because a few prophets have the evidence, must the rest have only faith? Rationalism says, No authority but *truth*. Whose truth? Why not Calvin's as well as Parker's?

Will God take away, by the law of progress, almost universal faith, and leave me without a ray of hope? Because Weiss & Co. are fed with their own deductions, and thrive by it, must I starve? Because Weiss's clover will not feed me, must I fall back on worms? In the midst of his satisfying clover, must Elijah starve because there are no ravens?

It would seem as though the only witness that the age demands, or that can satisfy it, is a voice from the tomb. Here is phenomena that answers that demand in its claims. True, it may be an hallucination. For reasons already mentioned, — its increasing influence, and its moral effect, — is not its particular fact worthy of attention? Is there any reason why, in writing in its defense, I should lose something of my moral and intellectual position, unless I weave into the structure of my communication the *respectable* fact or apology that the writer is not a believer in the spiritual explanation of these phenomena? He makes in this instance no such excuse.

Now, here is the fact desired, — *if it be a fact*. If it be the once dead speaking, has there been so important a question ever considered? Shall we reject it because it keeps company with publicans and sinners? Shall we refuse to wash and be clean because the river is simply Jordan? Shall we say, "What manner of departed spirits are these, that play on fiddles, and dance tables; that rap loud and soft on tables, walls, and doors?" Shall we say, "Nonsense!" while they every time say, "I am one of thy brethren, the prophets"? Why, it violates all my ideas of respect for the departed, and their condition.

"How are the mighty fallen!" Shades of great Franklin! you are in twenty places at the same time, and all unknown to each other. He must be a double-header. Oh, no! foolish dream! — I had rather be without the proof, the sweet evidence of life beyond the vale, if such is to be the end of all my greatness.

In this connection, bear in mind, there have been more atheists and infidels converted from their materialism to a belief in the soul's continued existence than by all the religious and rational logic during the same time. The great number, among whom is this writer, who have by these puerile phenomena, perceiving the underlying truth irrespective of its details and associations, who have passed from darkness to light and hope, is a fact or a good so important as should command a tender regard for it, set as it is so poorly. Pebbles become jewels sometimes by their setting. Here may be a jewel spoiled by its setting. Common sense (which is vulgar for rationalism) says, "Prove it worthless, or reset it."

It may be stated here, and truly, that Spiritualists do not claim for it admission as a demonstrated truth, to be universally accepted, unchallenged. They, of all people, say, "Examine for yourselves; and believe or reject, as your conviction dictates." There may be, and probably is, more error than truth in it. What venerated institution but must make the same confession? who would except the church on this point? Speaking for myself, the communication of disembodied spirits with mortals *is* a demonstrated truth. I make this statement with some little critical knowledge of mental phenomena, or what is called the Psychical side of life. A less cautious person, on the same evidence, might also speak equally strong of *identity*. The identity of individual spirits is by no means so established, even in a Spiritualist's mind, as that more indefinite one of disembodied intelligence. In a word (I am speaking for no one but myself now), there is no positive proof that Theodore Parker ever spoke to or through a mortal. The chances favor the assumption, that he may have done so, even if the result be silly — de-Parkerized by the process. But that a disembodied spirit, claiming to be Theodore Parker, or was once some special dweller of earth, has communicated through mortals, is to me no more a matter of doubt than that a man lives in Europe claiming to be Victor Hugo. The identity of the living is easy of demonstration; of the other, not so easy.

The obstacle is not in the quality of thought offered as Theodore Parker's. We do not know how spirit or mind controls matter: only, that, under certain conditions, it does: and we know, further, that

matt
a co
mast
in th
or s
ciati
noth
Shal
it be
will
all w
not
we r
W
prop
and
gen
give
as a
mix
hea
its
tiqu
hav

N
exc
bra
tim
inv
—
H.

matter controls spirit also ; that intemperance in eating may produce a condition of body, or rather of mind, incapacitating it for its master-pieces ; and Homer nods, or becomes Homer and water, even in the form, *before* he goes to the spirit life. But we would assume, or some would, that we know all the conditions of transit and association, between spirit and mortal life, when we know comparatively nothing of the connection between even our own souls and bodies. Shall we say then, there is nothing practical in it? all unreliable? Let it be so. That is another part of the subject. No thoughtful person will reject the fundamental fact, if he knows it to be a fact, because all we expected or hoped for is not available. Perhaps as yet there is not enough of the curves given us to measure the circle ; and in time we may be qualified.

With all the crudities in connection with this subject, I venture the prophecy, that this fact, being fundamentally a truth, has come to stay ; and that this generation shall not pass away before the church as a general thing will adopt it, and it will be the warm blood that will give it life. Thus not only will it be a feature, but it will be claimed as always having been a feature : latent for a while, having been mixed up with superstition ; but the old remembrances, will be heated red-hot again, and the image and superscription be made in its reproduction to bear testimony not only to the fact, but to its antiquity also. And thus again a stone which the builders rejected will have become the head of the corner.

JOHN WETHERBEE.

FRANZ WOEPKE.*

M. FRANZ WOEPKE, whose death the papers announced a few days ago,† was a man of the highest merit, though unknown except to a few special *savants*. He was learned in a number of branches, and eminent in all. The great mathematicians of our time praised his theoretic memoirs, and thought him "almost an inventor." He knew Arabic as well as M. de Sasy ; besides that,

* From the French of M. Henri Taine. Translated for "The Radical," by J. H. Senter. See Taine's "Italy, Rome, and Naples," p. 205.

† April, 1864.

Persian ; and, for some years back, Sanscrit. As to the modern languages of Europe, he spoke and wrote the principal of them as well as his mother tongue. As to general knowledge, philosophical and literary, what one gets from books, and what from men, I never knew a man who was better furnished with it. Though an orientalist and a mathematician, he never confined himself to special studies. On the contrary, from his earliest days, he proposed to himself, as his object, general truths and connected views. He busied himself with limited researches and special questions only through a natural aversion to vague considerations, and because he regarded these limited and concentrated works as the best discipline for the mind.

He had published, in French, German, and Italian, several memoirs upon pure mathematics and the history of mathematics. Of late, he had devoted his chief attention and his greatest effort to this second branch of human knowledge. He was contemplating for the future—for the close of his life—a general history of mathematics, at least from its origin in India to the Renaissance. But he hardly counted upon it. "One flatters himself with this hope," he said to me. "He does it for his encouragement. But there is a mental illusion there. The labor is too great, and a man's life is subject to many chances."—"I could easily make a system," he added another time. Only a little invention would be needed, and perhaps I am as capable of that as anybody else. But what good would it do, since my system would not be proved? And why should I lose my time in deceiving myself with phrases?" He thought that all general judgments upon the ancient history of mathematics, and the transition from ancient to modern sciences, ought to remain in suspense for one or two centuries more. He compared the knowledge that we have to-day, of Arab science and civilization, to what we had, in the sixteenth century, of Greek science and civilization, and believed, that, for a long time, all fruitful work must be limited, as in the age of Casaubon and Scaliger, to the publication of manuscripts. He had busied himself in this ungrateful and painful labor. He had published, corrected, annotated, several Arabic mathematical treatises. His last work is a memoir upon the history of the numerals which all use, on the probability of their Indian origin, on the different transmissions by which they have reached us. At the moment when death came, he was editing the work of an Arabian mathematician who went to India in the tenth century, and whose book shows us the state of the sciences in the two countries. He was intending to employ five years upon this work. What knowledge, exactness, patience, sustained,

minute, and laborious attention, such researches demand ; what journeys, weariness, and time for copying and comparing different manuscripts at Dublin, Oxford, Paris, Berlin ; what sagacity is needed in order to find the right reading under the bad writing of the copyists, and the true meaning beneath the imperfection of ancient language and methods ; what perseverance is necessary to return morning and evening to arithmetical and geometrical solutions long since exploded, useful only with reference to documents, incapable of exciting great speculative curiosity or great historical imagination, — no one, except the five or six *savants*, who, in Europe, are engaged in such studies, can estimate or say. He did not recoil : he continued to work almost every night, so as to profit by the silence, despite his poor health, while knowing that work made him worse. He was like one of the masons of the middle age, who, bent and covered with dust in the basement of a cathedral, wore out their lives in hewing one stone, and then another, and then still another, with no other pleasure than that of thinking at times of the great edifice that would one day rise upon those foundations, which their eyes would not see.

I have known him for twelve years, and I never met a man whose conversation was more profitable. He had observed the manners of several nations ; he had kept the company of the most illustrious *savants* ; he read all the most important modern books ; and on every subject had an original opinion. He could talk about everything, even women and *salons*, and always in a way that deserved attention. But he rarely talked, save when he was obliged to : he preferred to listen. When he gave his opinion, he did it in a very few words, with a slow voice and mathematical solidity. He seemed to have cast away from his ideas whatever abundance and brilliancy they may have had, so as to leave only their substance : his remarks were always like a *résumé*. The most marked characteristic of his mind was his hatred of charlatanry. This was the only subject on which he sneered, and became caustic ; and, when he put his finger upon the pretensions and insufficiencies of some contemporaries, his little *exposés* of facts, so exact and apparently so dry, reached the highest degree of the comic. As to his own abilities, he was always ready to underrate, even to disparage, himself. "I cannot speak of that," he used to say : "I have given no study to that point." His most ardent desire was never to be the dupe of himself. He always held himself ready to reconsider his opinions. He wished to admit nothing that was not true and proved, and preferred ignorance to conjectures. He had a profound feeling of the imperfection of our sciences, the limits

of every mind, of his own with the rest. Although he had loved metaphysics passionately, he had left it behind him, and considered it as only a convenient way of grouping facts, a provisional system, useful in withdrawing the mind from special researches, and in directing it to general truths and connected views. He compared the positive sciences to columns scarcely sketched out; some, at best, half constructed, but all so incomplete and separated from each other by so many gaps, that no mind could trace out the plan of the building to be supported upon them. Not that he was simply and dryly a poor hoist: he followed, with interest and sympathy, the lofty ideal constructions that some try to raise upon these rare supports; he thought that each ought to try to sketch out his own; and he considered, that, after all, the noblest employment of the sciences is to furnish matter for those lofty divisions, by which, notwithstanding our errors and doubts, we take part in the gratifications and the work of the centuries that will come after us.

Speculations of this sort were the whole of his joy. Of all the satisfactions that, in the eye of men, give a value to life, he was destitute. He lived alone, far from his country, far from his family, in a furnished chamber, soberly and in silence, on a pension that an Italian prince, a protector of mathematics, gave him; feeling himself obliged to publish, every year or two, some memoir, that he might deserve the money he received. His work had no recompense; not even glory. A few *savants* valued his researches, and that was all. He could not hope to gain, even in the future, that half-noisy reputation that satisfies the imaginative part of our soul, and which we call glory: his researches were too special. As to scientific employments and public honors, he did not care for them. He had a horror of all intrigue and parade; and, through a natural delicacy, when he saw others displaying themselves on the public stage, he went off discreetly and smiling to conceal himself in a corner. "My true satisfaction," he said to me one day, "is, that the learned men who may work after me will find a research well done; one that they can count upon, and from which they may advance to further steps." He passed the day in comparing texts in the libraries, and in following, at the *Collège de France*, courses in the higher mathematics and the oriental languages. In the night he wrote. His life was of a minute regularity. Work had made him an invalid from his youth. He suffered, besides, from a bronchial difficulty, and he had become hard of hearing. He was obliged to watch, be careful of injuring himself, and he performed all the sad service with admirable patience and *sang-froid*. He was a

stoic in heart and conduct. No one has practiced better the maxim that bids us "bear and forbear." Many times, in my thoughts, I have compared him to our dear and venerated Spinoza. His gentlemanliness was extreme, and his attention to all the little duties of society scrupulous. He seemed touched by the least service, as by a benefit. On first acquaintance, this politeness might even seem exaggerated and ceremonious. This was because he had prescribed it to himself as a law, and as one of those general principles that governed his conduct. "Men," he used to say, "have a natural tendency to brutality and selfishness; and, if they do not repress it even in their least and most insignificant actions, it is impossible for peace and benevolence to be maintained among them." His principle was, that we must always keep ourselves in check. "Our passions," he said to me, another time, "are like children. We love them and support them; they grow up, and overmaster us." When he was in company, he felt obliged to converse more particularly with elderly ladies; and his respectful, almost old-school manner, made a marked contrast with modern negligence. At such times, when he persisted in wearying himself voluntarily, and, as a matter of duty, in lowering so much learning and so many ideas to the puerilities of common conversation, you could not help looking with affectionate compassion upon that great pale brow furrowed with a deep wrinkle, and wishing him the happiness he did not have.

He was very reserved, and only for a few years had I been intimate with him. It was then, that, passing from abstract discussions to intimate conversations, I could appreciate his extreme nobleness and his lofty understanding. I dare affirm that I never knew a single defect in him. I ended with experiencing towards him a singular sentiment, a sort of respect. He is almost the only man of whom I could say such a thing. There are few minds that, when they have gone the round of ideas as he had, observed all sides of man, had not brought back bitterness or discouragement from the experience. Disenchantment induces selfishness. If men sacrifice themselves, most often it is because, to them, distance clothes objects with beautiful colors. When they have touched them, the charm is gone. Extreme scepticism leads to self-love. But he had remained generous, though he had become sceptical. From that great journey that he had made around things, he had retained only sadness and *sang-froid*. No fret that his youth was wasted, his health shattered, his forces lessened, his researches limited, his hopes reduced. In the midst of so many regrets one profound and secret regret showed itself at intervals. He was

born a geometrician, and he believed that he had made a mistake in devoting his life to history. Nevertheless, he lived resigned and calm, penetrated with a feeling of the necessities that engulf us or drag us along, predicted that the whole of wisdom consists in comprehending and accepting them.*

I had left him suffering, and the evening of my departure I had gone to get a physician. Afterwards, they had written me that he was better ; and I hoped to find him, on my return, active and calm as ever. He had promised me that he would take, henceforth, a month a year for living in the open air, and exercising in the country. Yesterday, on going out of the Sistine, I found in a paper in a Roman *café*, mention of his death and burial. The reader has no need of our personal sentiments. I refrain from expressing mine. Only I hope that one of his colleagues of the Asiatic Society will tell the public what he did, and what he could do. We need a competent man to give him his place. I have been able to speak only of his spirit and character. When, standing apart from myself, I try to judge him as a critic, I think that no one was worthier than he to be loved, admired, and to live. He was neither loved nor admired as he should have been, and he is dead at thirty-seven.

TANTALUS.

TANTALUS, Tantalus, O it is terrible !
Lifted to look at Bliss
Lightly debarred.

Bowing adoringly down to the beautiful,
Knowing 't will naught with thee
Worshiped afar.

Proffering rapturously Love's richest offering,
Flouted like Cain of old,
Frenzied with loss.

* He said to me one day : "I have taken life by the poetical side." Strange saying, and one of the profoundest that I have heard.

Tantalus.

211

Tantalus, Tantalus, O it is terrible !
Drawn to the door of Bliss,
Deftly debarred.

Trav'ling with poesy, pleading imploringly,
Power for delivering
The soul's lava-tide.

Baffled and impotent, still-born, anomalous,
Petrified mockery
Gained by the pain.

Tantalus, Tantalus, O it is terrible !
Fast by the gate of Bliss,
Fatally barred.

Tantalus, Tantalus, *God has no* TANTALUS
Over the cycles His
Fingers have formed,

Travel no "might have beens," all is completedness
When the grand ultimates
Stand forth unveiled.

In His Eternity, truly there's time enough,
Though stern Experience
Chasten thee long.

Faithfulest schoolmaster, gratefulest reverence,
Backward thou'lt smile at him
Crowned at the goal.

M. A. ARCHER.

EDITORIAL.

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION.

NO one can study the history of the Reformation without discovering that Dr. Martin Luther himself was very far from being a *reformed* man. If he was the leading spirit for the time, it was not because he grasped the great questions of reform in their broadest and fullest significance. He disturbed but little the common faith, and called into play the passions of men, fighting the battle by no means on what may be called an intellectual plane. He perceived scarcely more of what *private judgment* includes than his most bitter Catholic opponent. It was, indeed, a sublime moment when, in the Imperial Diet, he uttered those memorable words, "Here stand I. I can do no otherwise!" and they have fitly been made the chief inscription on the pedestal of his statue, recently set up at Worms, the scene of his greatest glory. But the attitude he there assumed was simply one taken in his own defence. It was Luther, roused into heroism, protesting in behalf of his own integrity. The principle of individual independence was attacked in his own person. The case was brought home: he was the injured party. But when we come to regard his career as a whole, and expect to find in it any near approach to a philosophical consistency of character, either in theory or practice, we are disappointed. Private judgment never meant private judgment to him. It had limits for others where his own had stopped. He set boundaries to the Reformation. They should be the Word of God, and of Luther his pastor. He inveighed against the "false brothers and heretics" who separated from him; and said, if they would not listen to him, it was so much the worse for them: "in the end, they would be seen, with the worthies whom they resembled, all burning in hell together." He tells of a man named

Marcus, who came to see him. "He was agreeable enough in his manners, and very courteous, but shallow-pated. As I found he went on talking about things entirely foreign to the Scriptures, I interrupted him by saying that I acknowledged only the Word of God; and that, if he sought to set up anything else, he must in the first place prove his mission by miracles. 'Miracles!' said he: 'you shall have miracles in seven years. God himself could not deprive me of my faith,' he added." Luther was greatly irritated by every such freak of private judgment as this; and all appeared to him as a freak, or worse, that he had not sanctioned. Even when there was a substantial agreement of others with himself in sentiment, he was not wholly tolerant, if they showed signs of an independent spirit. He had a sort of prior ownership of all ideas, and loved best to have others quote him. If they did not, it was abundant evidence to his mind that, they were "of the Devil" or "shallow-pated." Dr. Stiefel came to Wittenberg, and read to Luther his opinion of the Day of Judgment. "He considered that it would be on St. Luke's Day." Luther admonished him to silence. But Stiefel was impatient, for he believed that there was no time to lose. He urged, "This morning, as I was on my way, I saw a very fine rainbow, and I at once thought of the coming of Christ." Luther retorted in no gentle strain. "There will be no rainbow in the case. In one instant, one enormous thunderbolt will destroy every living creature, as one tremendous blast from the trumpet will awaken us all at the same moment; for it is no gentle breathing on a pipe that can make itself heard by those who are asleep in the tomb." Had Stiefel taken ground for clouds and thunderbolts, Luther would probably have thought of rainbows. He had himself once written "of a delicious rainbow," and said, "There are many who fear the clouds, and distrust the rainbow; but time will show its strength." He had his own views of the judgment, but deprecated the speculations of others. He said on one occasion, "Good and true theology consists in practice, use, and exercise. Its basis and foundation is Christ, whose passion, death, and resurrection are made manifest and intelligible to us by faith: with reference to these things, there has started up in our day, a *speculative theology*

which proceeds upon reason. This same *speculative theology* has for its author the Devil in hell."

It is well known that Luther was assailed in turn, and that the war of words was waged quite as fiercely in the nominally Protestant ranks, as elsewhere. The reformers, Zwinglius and others, sought to complete the work of the reformation by applying reason to whatever they were called upon to believe. They ventured to go outside of the Bible, and questioned, greatly to the disturbance of Luther, many of the holy mysteries. "Zwinglius," he says, "I regard as having drawn down upon himself the just hatred of all good men, by his daring and criminal manner of treating the Word of God. What a fellow is this Zwinglius! Ignorant as a block of grammar, and logic, and every other science." Zwinglius had written against the body of Christ being in the bread in any other than a "spiritual sense," destroying what one of Luther's biographers calls, "the old poetry of Christianity," which Luther would preserve. Luther denied free will. Erasmus affirmed it. This controversy nettled Luther beyond anything else; even his hate of the Pope was not so exasperating to him, for Erasmus wielded a powerful pen. He writes, referring to Erasmus, "If I fight against mud, whether I get the better of it or no, I am all the same covered with mud, and so the best way is to let mud pass on"; and thus broke off their discussion. Afterwards, "If ever I get well and strong again, I will fully and publicly assert my God against Erasmus"; and enjoined upon his friends that they should "vow enmity to Erasmus," and "be terrible and unflinching towards that serpent. I will write against him and kill him." He adds, "It is true that to crush Erasmus is like crushing a bug; but he has mocked and insulted my Christ, and he shall be punished." He sternly reproved Dr. Jeckel, for venturing, — "having so little experience, and being so imperfectly acquainted with logic and rhetoric," — to "set up opinions against his masters and preceptors;" and paid no respect to Jeckel, when he replied, "I must fear God more than I fear my masters; I have a God equally with yourself." No man seems to have been his friend any longer than he agreed with him, or accepted his "doctrines." When another set up for himself, he fought him:

he began at once to "preach against him." Speaking of Eisleben, he exclaims, "Oh, how painful it is to lose a friend that one has tenderly loved! That man used to be constantly at my table. *He was my cherished companion. We used to laugh and joke together, and, now he has turned against me. . . . This is intolerable. What! utterly to reject the law without which there can be no church, no government! . . . What! while I live, shall he be allowed to puff himself up with pride, presumption, and vanity?" Again he writes, "Who would have thought of that mischievous sect, the Antinomians, the assaulters of the law? I have outlived and endured three cruel tempests, Munzer, the Sacramentarians, and the Anabaptists. Now they are stilled and gone, others come on, insomuch that there will be no end of writing. I desire to live no longer; for there is no more hope of peace."

In this last sentence we are fully apprised to what extent the Reformation was comprehended by Luther. He desired to die, for there *was no more hope of peace*. He had wrested the Bible from the Pope, translated the New Testament, and given it to the people. The Pope said the people could not understand it. Luther thundered, "Let them try!" But woe to any, who, trying, understood it not as Dr. Martin Luther did! "Peace," was what the Pope desired above all things — even at the cost of Luther's private judgment. The peace of Luther, — that for which he would be contented to live, — would have sacrificed others in the same manner the Pope wished to dispose of him. This, however, is to be kept in mind, Luther was controlled by no petty interest; no selfishness of aim is to be detected: he was vehemently in earnest, and fought others only because he was confident that his own judgment was superior to theirs, if not absolutely infallible. He desired to save Germany from going to the devil, and knew of but one way by which the feat could be accomplished, — *Germany must listen to him*.

It cannot be said that Luther illustrated in his own life that one of his famous ninety-five theses, which reads, "*It is not in the course of nature for man to desire God to be God. He would rather himself be God, and that God were not God.*" But, next after God, one is forced to believe he had hoped to be instru-

mental in settling the controversies of his time. That he failed to satisfy his ambition in this respect, is evident enough from many sources, and especially in his conversations towards the end of his life. Instead of bringing about any great reformation, he abandoned the cause as well-nigh hopeless. It was no longer the Pope, but the emancipated people, "who desired to follow their own changeable policy, and to follow even this only as it may suit their caprices." — "Our people," he says, "give me greater trouble and uneasiness, and threaten me with greater dangers, than all popery put together; for, as to popery, it can never again do us any harm." He turned against the people (the world), and thought that the world hated him. "If I had known in the beginning that men were so hostile to the Word of God, I should certainly have held my peace, and kept myself quiet." In what this hostility consisted, may be inferred from the following bitter complaint: "Nobles, citizens, peasants, everybody, anybody, knows the gospel better than Dr. Luther, or even St. Paul himself. They all despise the pastors of God, or rather, the God of pastors." — He declared "the world is like a drunken peasant: put him on his horse on one side, and he tumbles over on the other. Take him in what way you may, you cannot help him, he won't let you. The world is bent upon going to the devil." — "I am persuaded," he often said, "that, for the last hundred years, there has not existed a man whom the world at large, hated more than it hates me. I, in my turn, am hostile to the world." When some one had observed, that, in fifty years hence, a great many changes would probably occur, which they could not then foresee, he cried out, "Pray God it may not exist so long: matters would be even worse than they have been. There would rise up infinite *sects* and *schisms*, which are as yet hidden in men's hearts, not yet mature. No: may the Lord come at once! let him cut the matter short with the Day of Judgment, for there is no amendment to be expected. You will see that before a long while wickedness will prevail, life will become so terrible to bear, that in every quarter the cry will be raised, God! come with thy last Judgment."

Luther's battle was against a *bad* Pope. His reformation

was a *better* Pope. His Protestantism was a rival dynasty. Its business was to crush the old ; to reign over its own subjects by the "Word of God." It is evident that Luther was restrained from most arbitrary proceedings for enforcing his own interpretations of the Bible only by a want of power. He gave Carlstadt a 'florin' in pledge of fair battle ; but, when the people showed 'too active an enthusiasm' for the opinions of Carlstadt, he obtained an order for his removal from the town. Carlstadt read an address to the people, signing it, "*Andrew Bodenstein, expelled, without a previous hearing or condemnation, by Martin Luther.*" Luther writes, "You see that I, who no long while ago just escaped being a martyr myself, am now, in my turn, a maker of martyrs. Egranus also, I hear, is setting up for a martyr ; a martyr, as he says to *the papists and Lutherans !* A fine story, truly !" He expressed a hope that such proceedings "would do a great deal of good to such of our preachers as have a tendency to ride the high horse." — "All the people now-a-days," he says, "reject that which does not happen to please each man's reason." — "Mr. Everybody," he thought, "should be made to demean himself piously, under the influence of the law and the sword, just as we keep wild beasts in good order by chaining them up." He became ironical : "The spirit of the new prophet flies very high indeed : 't is an audacious spirit that would have eaten up the Holy Ghost, feathers and all. Bible ! sneer these fellows : Bibel, Bubel, Babel ! And not only do they reject the Bible thus contemptuously ; but they say they would reject God, too, if he were not to visit them as he did his prophets."

One catches, from these stray bits of biography, the spirit of the time in which Luther lived and courageously toiled. They are sufficient to show from what small beginnings Protestantism has proceeded. They reveal, too, that Luther was by no means the foremost prophet of that day ; if, indeed, he may be ranked among the race of prophets at all. He fought his own hand-to-hand battle, but it was only to open the door of reform. *Would the people pass out, and sit in order and peace where he might direct !* Had the Reformation ended with his vision, it were a sad plight for mankind up to this day. He had helped to loose a

spirit he could not control. The people took too much to heart his own example, to be baffled henceforth, even by himself. While he hesitated and turned back before the spectacle of a genuine Protestant movement, they, with new leaders, quite as bold in heresies as he had been, and far more consistent in applying the principle of freedom they had won, marched on, practically saying, in the words of Dr. Jeckel, to Luther as to the Pope, "*I have a God equally with yourself.*"

In making this running sketch of Luther and his relations with his contemporaries, — necessarily left imperfect, — we see no occasion to detract from the well-established verdict as to his commanding moral character. *To say that he was a man entirely in earnest, is saying apparently very little; but, in his case, the remark covers a vast heroism, to which the world must long pay homage. The gathering at Worms, to unveil his statue, was a fair tribute to his memory. But the continuing work of the Reformation has left him far in the back-ground. He stands upon his pedestal as the man who struck a first strong blow; a blow originally aimed at the most conspicuous point where he saw the great deformity, — the head of the Church. It is a long stride onwards from Luther to Mazzini. The protest of the one was the A B C of the Reformation: that of the other is the final sentence of the civilized world, the verdict of the enlightened reason against the usurpations of outward authority in whatever form they shall appear.

PROFESSOR STOWE.

"THE present aspect of Judaism throughout Christendom is well-nigh astounding. I take regularly three Jewish newspapers — two in English, and one in German — and every week they contain articles against Christianity, very determined, and, not unfrequently, bitter and violent. The Jews are very active, and rapidly growing in wealth and influence. There are ten regularly employed preaching Rabbis in New York City, and nearly as many synagogues. Cincinnati is not behind New York in this respect, and there are four or five in Boston. Some of their synagogues in New York and Cincinnati are among the most costly and splendid religious edifices in the United States. They are establishing schools of the highest

order, and have commenced operations for an American Jewish National University of the highest class, and they already have one or two theological seminaries. They are getting into the first positions in every department of life in Europe and America ; and of an edition of the Talmud, now publishing in Berlin in the best style, twenty-eight volumes, large folio, and its translations, commentaries, and illustrations in abundance, they say they sold 40,000 copies during the last year. As to their spiritual aspirations, some of them seem devout and sober ; but their writers mostly, so far as I have seen, are about on a level with the "Radical" published in Boston. They seek no proselytes, but are the deadly enemies of Christianity."—*Prof. Stowe in "The Congregationalist."*

PROFESSOR STOWE, so it is reported, has passed the greater part of his life in an endeavor to show that the writers of the Bible were inspired men. He does not claim a verbal inspiration for the book, but thinks that the men who wrote it were taken possession of by the Holy Ghost, and made to see spiritual truths by virtue of a real exaltation of the mind. They were, however, perfectly unconscious of being thus manipulated. They spoke and wrote as entirely from their own spontaneity, as though there had been no inspiration in the case.

We have not seen the explanation of this double, yet single action, and do not know that any is given. But we are curious to know how Professor Stowe was able to make this important discovery. For instance, if Paul supposed that he was writing his letters to the Corinthians himself, and, in the manner most natural for him to write, what leads another person to infer the contrary? What evidence has Professor Stowe that the Holy Ghost was at the bottom of the affair, and not Paul himself? The professor does not depend much on miracles. He is more inclined towards naturalism. That is to say, all that happens takes place in a purely natural way. And yet, we should do him injustice, if we did not add,—some things happen to all appearances, naturally ; but, they are slyly wrought by the supernatural power of the Holy Ghost. This is his theory as we understand it.

Now, in a certain sense, and to a certain extent, we believe that Professor Stowe is sound. It is the man who is inspired, and not the colons and commas : although these are convenient,

often, for conveying the true meaning of one man's words to another. But, if we use the term "inspiration" at all, we delight to make it stand for somewhat more generous: we dislike the arbitrary, exclusive meanings attached to it. Our theory would be, that the Holy Ghost is a fixture, a permanent source of light, a well of water never failing; unto which, not only Paul, but every other man or woman, of any and every age, might draw near and possess himself or herself of the needed supply. The amount and kind should depend entirely on the person; no one should be limited but by an incapacity to receive. The mind must not be pre-occupied with other things than those it wants; neither with falsehood, nor with truths of another plane. It must be emptied of all *unholy* ghosts, before the Holy one can rush in to fill up the space. But this is the privilege of all men alike; of modern Jews equally with the ancient; it is the privilege of Orthodox and of Radical. But, it is only a privilege; just as it is our privilege to breathe pure or impure air: we may suit ourselves. The pure air will not come, and slyly take us in charge, when we are prone to stay where we must breathe such as is not pure. It is simply in readiness for our use when we are disposed. This, or somewhat like this, would be our theory.

But, let us for a while endeavor to look at the case in another light. If we are anything of ourselves at all, we must be that, whatever it be, in *essence*. We ourselves are *it*. We have faculties of sight. We see spiritual truths as we see other truths. We determine the facts of ethics as of physics. When we see the truths of one kind, it is the purely natural vision of the mind that enables us to do so. Why urge a different mode for perceiving truths of another kind? We need not call on supernatural agencies. Indeed, it is wholly a superfluous thing to do. Moreover, is it not contrary to good judgment to doubt our own power to grasp whatever truths it is necessary that we should have? We may claim the highest as the lowest; the noblest as the least; and need not *imagine* an unnatural genesis for either. We have original gifts, power of sight for the apprehension of facts, ranging all the way outward and upward as far as we need to go. Who shall set the limit?

It seems, then, from this view, not wonderful that Paul did not know of the interference of the Holy Ghost. He acted from his own spontaneity, as a man ought to do; as all men probably have done when they have acted with any decision and force. If inspired at all, it was by the sight of a better class of ideas than those he had formerly defended, but had now outgrown; gained by putting them under his feet to form the higher pedestal from which he should look, and command a larger and freer view. Paul was not a tunnel, but a man. He was not an avenue for the Holy Spirit. He *was* that Spirit. To suppose otherwise, is to put ourselves to the trouble, of accounting for the man in a *strange and purely imaginative* way, when we are able to summon the best of witnesses, whose veracity remains unimpeached, for the natural and ordinary.

We have turned aside from the purport of the paragraph quoted above, desiring only to contribute a passing thought to the attention of its writer, hoping he will not find it on a level either too high or too low for his use.

SCRAPS OF HISTORY.

A CENTURY from the Declaration that all men are equal in their birth — joint-heirs of the Kingdom of Opportunity: what is the question? — this:

SHALL THE NEGRO BE COUNTED AS A WHOLE MAN?

There is none other.

Until this issue is settled, nothing is settled.

Thirty years of agitation could not dispose of it.

The war has left it behind.

Grant and his party answer, "*He shall.*" (Their "ifs" and "buts" will, of necessity, disappear after election.)

Seymour and his party answer, "*No! not if we can prevent it.*"

The Slave-power like the devil-fish around the limbs and body of Gilliatt, had fastened itself upon the Republic.

It felt sure of its prey.

It thrust out its head.

The time came to strike.

Brown gave the first blow with a pike.

All that has happened since has been the effort of the entire loyal population to dispatch the wounded and enraged victim.

In this struggle the negro race was summoned into action.

Negroes did not ask for freedom, it was said. They would not use the pikes Brown's party carried down to them.

But they accepted bayonets.

They have accepted the ballot.

For what purpose? to maintain slavery?

Ask their old masters.

The war proved to be a trial of their manhood. They fought for a country which had enslaved them. The keen instinct of the negro — or, was it of the *brute*? — taught him to look beyond the short-comings of a prejudiced race, and see the goal.

"The year of jubilo is comin'."

He pointed this out to his children; and said, "You may see that time, if I don't. We will fight for the North, and save the flag."

By their aid the Union triumphed.

The Government had said to this black race successively: "You are men, — fight;" "You are men, — vote." Mr. Sumner now adds, "You are men, — take seats in the Senate."

A negro in the Senate?

No: only a man.

Four years more and Mr. Frederick Douglass may go to Congress. Eight years, and he may be the worthy successor of Grant.

Grant's prayer will then be answered.

We shall have *peace*, and pay our *debts*.

Neither the *negro*, nor the *bond-holder* will be cheated.

The Republic will have *redeemed* its proclamation.

This is more important than all else.

Peace rests upon Equity!

Fifty years hence Americans will be unable to understand the meanness of this epoch. The prejudices of race will have passed away. There will be but one race, and one glory.

NOTES.

SPIRITUAL WORSHIP.

PRAYER AND PRAISE.

IN 1836, Mr. Alcott printed his book of "Conversations on the Gospels." It has long been out of print. A re-print would be a good work. Perhaps a better would be for Mr. Alcott to elicit thought from the children of the present time, in a similar manner, but, taking up more modern texts to direct their thoughts. Much is being said in this age, which Mr. Alcott and the children might discuss to good purpose. However, we give below a chapter from his first book.

Mr. Alcott read the remainder of the

CONVERSATION OF JESUS WITH THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA.

John iv. 16 — 30.

- Worship. 16. Jesus saith unto her, Go, call thy husband and come hither.
17. The woman answered and said, I have no husband. Jesus said unto her, Thou hast well said I have no husband :
18. For thou hast had five husbands ; and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband ; in that saidst thou truly.
19. The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that thou art a prophet.
20. Our fathers worshiped in this mountain ; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.
21. Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.
22. Ye worship ye know not what : we know what we worship : for salvation is of the Jews.
23. But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth : for the father seeketh such to worship him.
24. God *is* a Spirit : and they that worship him must worship *him* in spirit and in truth.
25. The woman saith unto him, I know that Messias cometh, which is called Christ : when he is come, he will tell us all things.
26. Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am *he*.
27. And upon this came his disciples, and marvelled that he talked with the woman : yet no man said, What seekest thou ? or, Why talkest thou with her ?
28. The woman then left her waterpot, and went her way into the city, and saith to the men,
29. Come, see a man, which told me all things that ever I did : is not this the Christ ?
30. Then they went out of the city, and came unto him.

(Before he had time to ask the usual question.)

Immortality. SAMUEL T. *(spoke.)* I was most interested in this verse :
" He that drinks of this water shall thirst again, but he

that drinks of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst." He means by this, that those who heard what he taught, and did it, should live always, should never die, their spirits should never die.

MR. ALCOTT. Can spirit die?

SAMUEL T. For a spirit to die is to leave off being good.

Emblem of
Holiness.

EDWARD J. I was interested in the words, "For the water I shall give him will be in him a well of water." I think it means that when people are good and getting better, it is like water springing up always. They have more and more goodness.

SAMUEL R. Water is an emblem of holiness.

MR. ALCOTT. Water means Spirit, pure and unspoiled.

EDWARD J. It is holy spirit.

Idolatry.

ELLEN. I was most interested in these words: "Ye worship ye know not what." The Samaritans worship idols, and there was no meaning to that.

MR. ALCOTT. What do you mean by their worshipping idols?

ELLEN. They cared about things more than God.

MR. ALCOTT. What kind of false worship do you think Jesus was thinking about, when he said: "Woman, the hour is coming and now is, when neither in this mountain —"?

ELLEN. Oh! she thought the place of worship was more important than the worship itself.

MR. ALCOTT. Well! how did Jesus answer that thought?

ELLEN. He told her what she ought to worship, which was more important than where.

MR. ALCOTT. Some of you, perhaps, have made this mistake, and thought that we only worshiped God in churches, and on Sundays. How is it — who has thought so?

(Several held up hands, smiling.)

Who knew that we could worship God any where?

(Others held up hands.)

Spiritual
Worship.

What other worship is there beside that in the Church?

EDWARD J. The worship in our hearts.

MR. ALCOTT. How is that carried on?

EDWARD J. By being good.

NATHAN. We worship God by growing better.

AUGUSTINE. We worship God when we repent of doing wrong.

Sincerity. JOSIAH. I was most interested in this verse: "God is a spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." It means that to feel our prayers is more important than to say the words.

LEMUEL. And when we pray and pray sincerely.

MR. ALCOTT. What is praying sincerely?

LEMUEL. Praying the truth.

MR. ALCOTT. What is to be done in praying the truth? When you think of prayer, do you think of a position of the body — of words?

LEMUEL. *(Earnestly.)* I think of something else, but I cannot express it.

MR. ALCOTT. Josiah is holding up his hand ; can he express it ?

Idea of prayer. JOSIAH (*burst out*). To pray, Mr. Alcott, is to be good really ; you know it is better to be bad before people and to be good to God alone, because then we are good for goodness sake, and not to be seen, and not for people's sake. Well, so it is with prayer. There must be nothing outward about prayer ; but we must have some words, sometimes ; sometimes we need not. If we don't feel the prayer, it is worse than never to say a word of prayer. It is wrong not to pray, but it is more wrong to speak prayer and not pray. We had better do nothing about it, Mr. Alcott ! we must say words in a prayer, and we must feel the words we say, and we must do what belongs to the words.

Actual Prayer. MR. ALCOTT. Oh ! there must be doing, must there ?

JOSIAH. Oh ! yes, Mr. Alcott ! doing is the most important part. We must ask God for help, and at the same time try to do the thing we are to be helped about. If a boy should be good all day, and have no temptation, it would not be very much ; there would be no improvement ; but if he had temptation, he could pray and feel the prayer, and try to overcome it, and would overcome it ; and then there would be a real prayer and a real improvement. That would be something. Temptation is always necessary to a real prayer, I think. I don't believe there is ever any real prayer before there is a temptation ; because we may think and feel and say our prayer ; but there cannot be any doing, without there is something to be done.

MR. ALCOTT. Well, Josiah, that will do now. Shall some one else speak ?

JOSIAH. Oh, Mr. Alcott, I have not half done !

Responsive Prayer. EDWARD J. Mr. Alcott, what is the use of responding in church ?

MR. ALCOTT. Cannot you tell ?

EDWARD J. No ; I never knew.

JOSIAH. Oh ! Mr. Alcott !

MR. ALCOTT. Well, Josiah, do you know ?

JOSIAH. Why, Edward ! is it not just like a mother's telling her child the words ? The child wants to pray ; it don't know how to express its real thoughts, as we often say to Mr. Alcott here ; and the mother says words, and the child repeats after her the words.

EDWARD J. Yes ; but I don't see what good it does.

JOSIAH. What ! if the mother says the words, and the child repeats them and feels them — really wants the things that are prayed for — can't you see that it does some good ?

EDWARD J. It teaches the word-prayer — it is not the real prayer.

JOSIAH. Yet it must be the real prayer, and the real prayer must have some words.

Ritual of Worship. But, Mr. Alcott, I think it would be a great deal better, if, at church, everybody prayed for themselves. I don't see why one person should pray for all the rest. Why could not the minister pray for himself, and the people pray for themselves ; and why should not all communicate their thoughts ? Why should only

one speak? Why should not all be preachers? Everybody could say something; at least, everybody could say their own prayers, for they know what they want. Every person knows the temptations they have, and people are tempted to do different things. Mr. Alcott! I think Sunday ought to come oftener.

MR. ALCOTT. Our hearts can make all time Sunday.

JOSIAH. Why, then, nothing could be done! There must be week-days, I know — some week-days; I said, Sunday oftener.

MR. ALCOTT. But you wanted the prayers to be doing prayers.

Prayer of Faith. Now some of the rest may tell me, how you could pray doing prayers.

GEORGE K. Place is of no consequence. I think prayer is in our hearts. Christian prayed in the cave of Giant Despair. We can pray anywhere, because we can have faith anywhere.

MR. ALCOTT. Faith, then, is necessary?

GEORGE K. Yes; for it is faith that makes the prayer.

MR. ALCOTT. Suppose an instance of prayer in yourself.

GEORGE K. I can pray going to bed or getting up.

MR. ALCOTT. You are thinking of time, — place, — words.

GEORGE K. And feelings and thoughts.

MR. ALCOTT. And action?

GEORGE K. Yes; action comes after.

JOHN B. When we have been doing wrong and are sorry, we pray to God to take away the evil.

MR. ALCOTT. What evil, the punishment?

Forgiveness. JOHN B. No; we want the forgiveness.

MR. ALCOTT. What is for-give-ness; is it anything given?

LEMUEL. Goodness, Holiness.

JOHN B. And the evil is taken away.

MR. ALCOTT. Is there any action in all this?

JOHN B. Why yes! there is thought and feeling.

MR. ALCOTT. But it takes the body also to act; what do the hands do?

JOHN B. There is no prayer in the hands!

MR. ALCOTT. You have taken something that belongs to another; you pray to be forgiven; you wish not to do so again; you are sorry. Is there anything to do?

JOHN B. If you injure anybody, and can repair it, you must, and you will, if you have prayed sincerely; but that is not the prayer.

MR. ALCOTT. Would the prayer be complete without it?

JOHN B. No.

ANDREW. Prayer is in the Spirit.

MR. ALCOTT. Does the Body help the Spirit?

ANDREW. It don't help the prayer.

Dramatic Prayer. MR. ALCOTT. Don't the lips move?

ANDREW. But have the lips anything to do with the prayer?

MR. ALCOTT. Yes; they may. The whole nature may act together; the body pray; and I want you to tell an instance of a prayer

in which are thoughts, feelings, action; which involves the whole nature, body and all. There may be prayer in the palms of our hands.

ANDREW. Why, if I had hurt anybody, and was sorry and prayed to be forgiven, I suppose I should look round for some medicine and try to make it well.

(Mr. Alcott here spoke of the connection of the mind with the body, in order to make his meaning clearer.

SAMUEL R. If I had a bad habit and should ask God for help to break it; and then should try so as really to break it—that would be a prayer.

CHARLES. Suppose I saw a poor beggar-boy hurt, or sick, and all bleeding; and I had very nice clothes, and was afraid to soil them, or from any such cause should pass him by, and bye and bye I should look back and see another boy helping him, and should be really sorry and pray to be forgiven—that would be a real prayer; but if I had done the kindness at the time of it, that would have been a deeper prayer.

AUGUSTINE. When anybody has done wrong, and does not repent for a good while, but at last repents and prays to be forgiven, it may be too late to do anything about it; yet that might be a real prayer.

MR. ALCOTT. Imagine a real doing prayer in your life.

LUCIA. Suppose, as I was going home from school, some friend of mine should get angry with me, and throw a stone at me; I could pray not to be tempted to do the same, to throw a stone at her, and would not.

MR. ALCOTT. And would the not doing anything in that case be a prayer and an action? Keeping your body still would be the body's part of it.

LUCIA. Yes.

ELLEN. I heard a woman say, once, that she could pray best when she was at work; that when she was scouring floor she would ask God to cleanse her mind.

Devotion to the Holy. MR. ALCOTT. I will now vary my question. Is there any prayer in Patience?

ALL. A great deal

MR. ALCOTT. In Impatience?

ALL. No; not any.

MR. ALCOTT. In Doubt?

GEORGE K. No; but in Faith.

MR. ALCOTT. In Laziness?

ALL (*but Josiah*). No; no kind of prayer.

JOSIAH. I should think that Laziness was the prayer of the body, Mr. Alcott.

MR. ALCOTT. Yes; it seems so. The body tries to be still more body; it tries to get down into the clay; it tries to sink; but the spirit is always trying to lift it up and make it do something.

EDWARD J. Lazy people sometimes have passions that make them act.

MR. ALCOTT. Yes ; they act downwards.

Is there any prayer in disobedience ?

ALL. No.

MR. ALCOTT. Is there any in submission ?

In forbearing when injured ?

In suffering for a good object ?

In self-sacrifice ?

ALL. (*Eagerly to each question.*) Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes.

(*Mr. Alcott here made some very interesting remarks on loving God with all our heart, soul, mind, &c., and the Idea of Devotion it expressed. Josiah wanted to speak constantly, but Mr Alcott checked him, that the others might have opportunity, though the latter wished to yield to Josiah.*)

Idea of Universal Adoration and Peace.

JOSIAH (*burst out*). Mr. Alcott ! you know Mrs. Barbauld says in her hymns, Everything is prayer ; every action is prayer ; all nature prays ; the bird prays in singing ; the tree prays in growing ; men pray ; men can pray more ; we feel ; we have more — more than nature ; we can know and do right ; Conscience prays ; all our powers pray ; action prays. Once we said here, that there was a "Christ in the bottom of our Spirits" when we try to be good ; then we pray in Christ ; and that is the whole.*

MR. ALCOTT. Yes, Josiah, that is the whole. That is Universal Prayer — the adoration of the Universe to its Author !

Reverence of the Godlike in Conscience.

CHARLES. I was most interested in this verse — "The day is coming, and now is, when men shall worship the Father," &c. I think that this means that people are about to learn what to worship, and where.

MR. ALCOTT. Have you learned this to-day ?

CHARLES. Yes ; I have learnt some new things, I believe.

MR. ALCOTT. What are you to worship ?

CHARLES. Goodness.

MR. ALCOTT. Where is it ?

CHARLES. Within.

MR. ALCOTT. Within what ?

CHARLES. Conscience, or God.

MR. ALCOTT. Are you to worship Conscience ?

CHARLES. Yes.

MR. ALCOTT. Is it anywhere but in yourself ?

CHARLES. Yes ; it is in Nature.

MR. ALCOTT. Is it in other people ?

Reverence of Humanity. CHARLES. Yes ; there is more or less of it in other people, unless they have taken it out.

MR. ALCOTT. Can it be entirely taken out ?

CHARLES. Goodness always lingers in Conscience.

MR. ALCOTT. Is Conscience anywhere but in Human Nature ?

* This improvisation is preserved in its words. Josiah, it may be named, was under seven years of age, and the other children were chiefly between the ages of six and twelve years.

Reverence of
the Invisible.

CHARLES. It is in the Supernatural.

MR. ALCOTT. You said at first that there was something in outward Nature, which we should worship.

CHARLES. No; I don't think we should worship anything but the Invisible.

MR. ALCOTT. What is the Invisible?

CHARLES. It is the Supernatural.

JOHN B. It is the Inward—the Spiritual.

But I don't see why we should not worship the sun a little as well—

Admiration
of Nature.

MR. ALCOTT. As well as the Sunmaker? But there are sun-worshippers.

JOHN B. Yes; a little; for the sun gives us light and heat.

MR. ALCOTT. What is the difference between your feeling when you think of the sun, or the ocean, (*he described some grand scenes,*) and when you think of Conscience acting in such cases as—(*he gave some striking instances of moral power.*) Is there not a difference?

(*They raised their hands.*)

What is the name of the feeling with which you look at Nature?

SEVERAL. Admiration.

MR. ALCOTT. But when Conscience governs our weak body, is it not a Supernatural Force? Do you not feel the awe of the inferior before a superior nature? And is not that worship? The sun cannot produce it.

Spiritual Awe.

JOSIAH. Spirit worships Spirit. Clay worships Clay.

Supremacy of
Spirit over
Nature.

MR. ALCOTT. Wait a moment, Josiah. I wish to talk with the others; let me ask them this question;—Do you feel that Conscience is stronger than the mountain, deeper and more powerful than the ocean? Can you say to yourself, I can remove this mountain?

JOSIAH (*burst out*). Yes, Mr. Alcott! I do not mean that with my body I can lift up a mountain—with my hand; but I can feel; and I know that my Conscience is greater than the mountain, for it can feel and do; and the mountain cannot. There is the mountain, there! It was made, and that is all. But my Conscience can grow. It is the same kind of Spirit as made the mountain be, in the first place. I do not know what it may be and do. The Body is a mountain, and the Spirit says, be moved, and it is moved into another place.

Worldliness.

Mr. Alcott, we think too much about Clay. We should think of Spirit. I think we should love Spirit, not Clay. I should think a mother now would love her baby's Spirit; and suppose it should die, that is only the Spirit bursting away out of the Body. It is alive; it is perfectly happy; I really do not know why people mourn when their friends die. I should think it would be matter of rejoicing. For instance: now, if we should go out into the

Release from
Flesh.

street and find a box—an old dusty box—and should put into it some very fine pearls, and bye and bye the box

should grow old and break, why, we should not even think about the box ; but if the pearls were safe, we should think of them and nothing else. So it is with the Soul and Body. I cannot see why people mourn for bodies.

MR. ALCOTT. Yes, Josiah ; that is all true, and we are glad to hear it. Shall some one else now speak beside you ?

JOSIAH. Oh, Mr. Alcott ! then I will stay in the recess and talk.

MR. ALCOTT. When a little infant opens its eyes upon this world, and sees things out of itself, and has the feeling of admiration, is there in that feeling the beginning to worship ?

JOSIAH. No, Mr. Alcott ; a little baby does not worship. It opens its eyes on the outward world, and sees things, and perhaps wonders what they are ; but it don't know anything about them or itself. It don't know the uses of anything ; there is no worship in it.

MR. ALCOTT. But in this feeling of wonder and admiration which it has, is there not the beginning of worship that will at last find its object ?

JOSIAH. No ; there is not even the beginning of worship. It must have some temptation, I think, before it can know the thing to worship.

MR. ALCOTT. But is there not a feeling that comes up from within, to answer to the things that come to the eyes and ears ?

JOSIAH. But feeling is not worship, Mr. Alcott.

MR. ALCOTT. Can there be worship without feeling ?

JOSIAH. No ; but there can be feeling without worship. For instance, if I prick my hand with a pin, I feel, to be sure, but I do not worship.

MR. ALCOTT. That is bodily feeling. But what I mean is, that the little infant finds its power to worship in the feeling which is first only admiration of what is without.

JOSIAH. No, no ; I know what surprise is, and I know what admiration is ; and perhaps the little creature feels that. But she does not know enough to know that she has Conscience, or that there is temptation. My little sister feels, and she knows some things ; but she does not worship.*

MR. ALCOTT. Now I wish you all to think. What have we been talking about to-day ?

CHARLES. Spiritual Worship.

MR. ALCOTT. And what have we concluded it to be ?

CHARLES. The Worship of Spirit in Conscience.

"One of the most frequent objections raised against the principle of an interior development is, that the answers are not really those of the children, but of the teacher. And in proof of this, parents have adduced the fact, that they never could succeed in eliciting such ex-

* Here I was obliged to pause, as I was altogether fatigued with keeping my pen in long and uncommonly constant requisition. I was enabled to preserve the words better than usual, because Josiah had so much of the conversation, whose enunciation is slow, and whose fine choice of language and steadiness of mind, makes him easy to follow and remember. — Recorder.

pressions from their own children, as these printed conversations report. The latter is quite true ; but it does not prove the former assumption. A truly spiritual mind is requisite to the justly putting a spiritual question ; and this is not attained by imitation, nor by education wholly, but by genius chiefly, by generation, by the Spirit's presence. In the few leisure moments of a mercantile man, there can be none of that large and deep preparation which preceded these remarkable results, of which we readily concede such a parent may rationally doubt. The anxieties of domestic life, whether rich or poor, also preclude the mother from coming into that serene and high relationship to her little ones, without which no approach to spirit-culture can be effected. Skepticism is unavoidable until the doubter is in a position to try the experiment, and such position is unattainable while he doubts.

"But supposing it were a fact, that the responses are not spontaneous, but mere echoes of the teacher's mind, it is not a small achievement to have discovered a mode of tuition which, while it is highly agreeable to the student, succeeds so well in making him acquainted with the deepest facts of all existence. Could it not, then, still more easily open to him the superficial facts, to attain which years and years of dull laborious college life are painfully occupied? If the laws in moral consciousness can there be presented to children ; assuredly the reported facts in history and language should not be suffered to be any longer a grievous burden to our young men."

EDITORS OF THE RADICAL. — A member of the "Union for Christian Work" in this city, I have been much interested in your article on "Majority-Blindness," in the July number. Christ "went about doing good," and in that connection only, do I see any appropriateness in having the word "Christian" form a part of our name. With your argument against its use, by a similar association in Boston, I can personally, fully unite, and would be better pleased if our own title was "Union for good Works."

But I wished particularly to call attention to the fact, that, however much this movement may have been "especially designed" to reach the "outside infidel," and non-church-going class, it is evidently destined also to reach, liberate, enlighten, and sustain that class of worshippers at divine service who are regular attendants — not from full sympathy and unison of feeling, but from a desire to go somewhere, rather than remain at home all day ; and who, although in some cases, occupying the conspicuous positions of deacons and elders, admit, when questioned squarely, that they do not, and cannot endorse many of the creeds and doctrines of their own churches. This is one of our

many works, methinks, and an important one, to assist in removing from the community all shades of bigotry and superstition, and all conceptions of religious faith and duty which are based upon, or are an outgrowth of, the false ideas of past ages.

Coming forth from nearly all the several denominations, and with privilege of joining us without assenting to any religious dogmas whatever, the class to which we refer will ever be increasing, and forming a large element in these "Unions"; and to those persons the word "Christain" may have, at first, an inviting look, and serve as an introduction to our rooms. The "infidel" portion of the outsiders, being usually the most advanced in liberal thoughts and religious ideas, can certainly afford to have such a sign over their door (if not deceptive, with a correct interpretation), as will induce the largest number of insiders to enter, and, perchance, be "converted" anew. And to the non-educated, roving, and reckless portion of the outside class, the sign or name will make very little difference. Our effect on them—to whom a large share of our attention should be directed, will depend almost wholly on the manner in which they are approached and the quality of the cordiality we extend to them.

The decided tendency of this movement will probably be, like that of the "Parker Fraternity" of Boston, to liberalize all the church societies within the scope of its influence, and to teach the people that their present and future happiness depends more upon the daily conduct of their lives, than upon a belief in this or that doctrine.

Providence, July, 1868.

G. K.

THE most manly method, it strikes us, is, to call things by their right names, to say what you mean as clearly as you can. The little strokes of wit by which you gain some over to your side, are demoralizing. It is better to swear. Better still it is to have nothing to do with gaining others over. One is not supposed to know of their little prejudices. It is their business to attend to those. You have only to do your own work, and in an ideal fashion,—that is to say, the best thing you know in the best manner you know. "Let the wide world wag as it may." We say this respectfully, and because we have *faith* in the "wide world." Do not compromise with it. "Ye cannot serve both God and Mammon." Now God to you is your own conviction, truth, your ideal-love, pleasure, whatever these may be. All outside, or all else, is devil, mammon, or something of that nature. The practical way is to adhere to yourself. If you are wrong, you will

be modified, made over; for you will be overpowered by those who are right. I mean, you will be persuaded by their attitude, your own mind will readjust itself; and you will surrender quietly and thankfully. The "wide world" will do the same. It never honors those who court it with concessions. It *uses* them often, and uses them up.

Now what would be easier, simpler, nobler, if a "Union" is needed, than to place it on good, truth-telling footing; let it be for *all* on equal terms. Let it have "an inviting look" for all.

This is the way we look at the case, but we doubt not "G. K." is following his own path as resolutely, in testing the direction indicated in the above letter.

S. H. M.

WHAT shall take the place of the Church, for those who desire some satisfactory methods of entertainment and instruction? This is a question properly asked, and easily answered. A simple business organization is needed to provide the means for paying ladies and gentlemen to lecture, or hold conversations. A few persons in every town could readily arrange the matter, and by acting in concert along a line of travel East and West, provide for the winter, at a reasonable cost.

We are led to speak of this by receiving a number of letters bearing on the subject. Let persons interested, put into the effort one-half the sense and energy they display in ordinary business life, and their success will be placed beyond doubt.

A course of lectures this winter on radical religion, in Eastern and Western towns would undoubtedly prove to be a happy feature of the year. In every locality new and sympathizing faces would appear, and interesting acquaintances be formed. There are more people inquiring, and free to interest themselves in the subject, than one at first believes.

To meet with new persons, and establish a social compact, unbiased by any outward form of creed, or Church discipline, gaining at the same time all the Church would provide for, and much more in the way of intellectual life and esthetic culture, is a privilege the unchurched part of each community owe it to themselves to secure. The time is propitious. The age of ceremony it is not possible again to revive. Plain, thoughtful speech; cheerful conversation; a higher literature, art, science; shall do for America, what other religious enterprises have failed to attain.

S. H. M.

THE July number of "The Monthly Religious Magazine" has an article on "The Irreligion of Poor Work," which deserves attention. With the theology of our contemporary we are wholly unable to agree, but we shall give it the hand of fellowship so long as it publishes essays so sound and reasonable as the one referred to.

MATHEW ARNOLD'S essays on "Authority and Anarchy," republished in "Every Saturday," should be read, though they are not much in the American way of thinking, and though Mr. A. affects to write as if he translated from the Greek. In the last of his essays the audacious writer professes an opinion that our civilization has had a surfeit of "Hebraism," and that a course of "Hellenism" might now have the effect of Star Spring Water, to remove effete matter and quicken vitality in the system.

D. A. W.

"THE DIM RELIGIOUS LIGHT."

THE "First Church Society" of Boston, in Berkeley street, has prayed. It was for a remission of the duties on some painted glass windows which the Church wanted for obscuring its interior, with a hope to imitate, in a box, the effect that belongs to a Cathedral.

Religious be, but dim at any rate,
Truth needs the rouge upon her naked beauty:
Alas, too many churches in the State
Already have their light exempt from Duty.

Oh Churches, if the light within you be
But darkness tinted up by Scripture story!
Ye crave a light subdued—what mockery!
A light triumphant is the church's glory.
National Anti-Slavery Standard.

SHELLEY, perhaps the noblest poet of Liberty and Progress that the world has yet brought forth, married twice. His second wife was the daughter of Mary Wollstonecraft. She was named for her mother, Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin. In dedicating to her his noble "Revolt of Islam," Shelley speaks of her mother thus:

"They say that thou wert lovely from thy birth,
Of glorious parent thou aspiring child;
I wonder not; for One then left this earth,
Whose life was like a setting planet mild,

"Which clothed thee in the radiance undefiled
Of its departing glory; still her fame
Shines on thee through the tempest dark and wild
Which vex these latter days."

— *The Revolution.*

"THE RADICAL" makes a slight mistake as to "THE REVOLUTION" and Mary Wollstonecraft's invaluable work. We are publishing it entirely, to be completed in our second volume. Though the most powerful argument for Woman's Rights ever framed, it has long been wholly out of the market.

— *The Revolution.*

THADDEUS STEVENS.

LONG he leagued with Life for time,
And Death rejected.
Many years he heard death-music near him chime,
And stood protected:

Bearing up by sheerest will
To man his post;
Watching keen, to guard a people perilled still,
To win the most.

"*Died at midnight!*" his stern task
Then only done.
Rested not his course to doubt the way, or ask,
"Is the race yet won?"

Valorous man! claiming the right
Unto the end.
Well knew how to route disloyal might
Of foe or friend.

When the Day comes girt with power,
His truth shall stand.
All men learn what worth belongs with every hour,
In every land.

August 13, 1868.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

THE WORSHIP OF JESUS IN ITS PAST AND PRESENT ASPECTS. By SAMUEL JOHNSON, minister of the Free Church at Lynn. Boston : William V. Spencer, 203 Washington Street. 1868. pp. 92.

Every effort which is made, in the interest of reason and science, to find the historical position of Christianity, and to account for the development of its spiritual truths without recourse to marvels and impossibilities, is met by the conservatives, with the triumphant cry, "Here is Christianity — here are the astonishing phenomena of its position and influence in the world : they are directly traceable to a narrative, and the narrative grows out of a person : if either be explained away, the phenomena are left in mid air, unsupported — eighteen solid centuries without a root."

It is one object of rational religion to show how the developing soul of mankind accounts for all the great men and the salutary phenomena of the past and present, and to cure the mind of its slavish trick of interpolating miracles always where nature has always shown herself sufficient. It is true, the mind thus pays its homage to its own sense of commanding excellence ; but this moral feeling does not cancel the irrationality of the effort to buttress history with mythology. Anything that is developed, in any province of human thought, feeling and action, might thus be supposed to lack its own sufficing tendency, derived directly from the divine presence, from the perpetual nature of an indwelling reason. This supposition is always made where a strict mental method does not exist to preside over the observation of facts. When such a method arrives, it selects the facts from the mythology : but any generation is liable to mythologize again whenever facts seem to transcend its method. Fancy throws its pontoon of the supernatural across from its perception to its ignorance, and God comes travelling thereby with a fresh budget of marvel. When the mind comes up to the very edge of the mirage, it disappears, and every object stands unquivering in the natural light. There is a portion of ignorance which secures an unhistorical period to every generation, and fringes even its scientific strivings with a penumbra of astrology, alchemy, and kindred dreams. If we assume that it is constantly diminishing before the guarantees of scientific method, we only say that it prevailed most at times and in places that were ill-furnished with such a method, and where the imagination bade striking and favorite objects loom without stint, to be lifted into the appearance of a historical basis. But the only history in such periods is in the genuineness of the soul's own predilections for truth and beauty. These will cluster around the nearest magnet, and, as they cling thrilling to it, do not anticipate a later capacity to determine that it only shares

the natural element which penetrates all things and makes the earth's meridians its daily road.

This little pamphlet, so simply and earnestly written, with such a love for truth, and such reverence for the intellectual methods which alone discover and confirm it, is composed with the above idea: to show that Jesus was genuine, because religion itself is: that his virtue was authentic, because it has been the longing, and is always the possibility, of the human soul. The imagination which expects, hopes, prophecies human excellencies and triumphs, has constantly invested with supernature, the persons who have approached the nearest to the fulfilment of its own moral and spiritual nature. In every race and country this has been the story.

Mr. Johnson shows how this tendency to idealization invested other persons at the Christian era, and for several subsequent centuries. With admirable scholarship he shows how the great ideas and tendencies of humanity which lead to this investiture have been in all ages the same, and identical in the philosopher and the illiterate; and that these, by developing into light and consciousness, have constructed the genuine history of religion; that they are the pith of all Scripture, and the pretext of all mythology.

Mr. Johnson is not, like our Conservatives, so poorly off for moral and spiritual faith, that he is obliged to construct an absolutely perfect man, and to keep his sinless perfection from caving in by a constant shoring up with miracles. He knocks all the miraculous away, and his divine man does not come clattering down into the unintelligible nonentity that our Orthodox friends so dread. The man was in nature, and is there still, and is mankind's ideal of its own possible excellence. And this, too, is the root of Christianity, the cause of its development, the explanation of its influence, the condition of its growth and future improvement. It is the love of man and the love of God fashioning itself in continuance from the beginning, the life of people and of their foolish creeds, and the only palliation of their preposterous superstitions. It is the climbing and culminating nature of man's best ideas, which ere long will be joined to a true mental method, and discard the old tricks and pretexts of the supernatural.

This pamphlet is a solid contribution to the objects of radical religion. We would fain extol the sweet and noble spirit of the writer; but whoever reads his pages will best perform an office that is grateful to all sincere souls.

J. W.

"AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, CRITICAL, EXEGETICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. By Samuel Davidson, D. D. In two volumes. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1868."

THE preface to these interesting volumes gives evidence of a modest and devout spirit in their author, combined with a conviction that the results of critical inquiry in regard to the New Testament records in Germany, Holland and France, for thirty years past, are of sufficient consequence to be

presented in a popular form to the British public, and the readers of English everywhere. Since the appearance of the very valuable works published in those countries within the period named, neither the Gospels nor the other writings of the New Testament can be studied exclusively from the old point of view. The writings of scholars so eminent and so trustworthy as those who have published the criticism in question can no longer be ignored; and any attempt to repress the spirit of inquiry thus roused is scarcely consistent with a love of truth. All who value truth above tradition will submit the pages of the New Testament without fear to a full investigation. The custom prevailing in England has generally been to ignore views on this subject contrary to traditional opinions, or else to speak of them with strong condemnation; but a better day, the author thinks, is already dawning, when reason, "the candle of the Lord" within us, will be vilified no more, and the highest evidence for the divine origin of Scripture will be found in the spiritual nature of man.

The purpose of an Introduction to the New Testament is to discuss all such questions respecting each book as its age, author, object and aim, credibility, characteristics, integrity, contents. In considering these matters, difficult questions, on which the evidence is conflicting, have to be treated, and slender probabilities to be weighed. In these circumstances the author has exercised his best judgment, reaching conclusions cautiously where acute scholars differ.

Speaking of the fact that religion is often confounded with a system of theological dogmas, and of the bitterness between theologians thence arising, Dr. Davidson says:—

"If men could see that the Spirit of God neither dwelt exclusively in apostles, nor rendered them infallible, however highly gifted they may have been, the sacred records would be less distorted, and different values would be assigned to the several parts of the volume according to their nature. When those records are held to be absolutely correct in all matters, whether historical or speculative, scientific or doctrinal, they acquire a supernatural and fictitious pre-eminence similar to that which is conferred on the pope by the theory of papal infallibility; they are called God's word throughout, which they never claim to be, and thus free inquiry into their credibility is at once checked or suppressed. God's word is in the Scriptures: all Scripture is not the word of God. The writers were inspired in various degrees, and are therefore not all equally trustworthy guides to belief and conduct. In the Bible may be found all things necessary for our salvation; it is an unwarrantable inference that it contains nothing but what is thus needed for all. The Scriptures contain the highest truth; but this fact is undisturbed by the possibility that they may contain some things which are not truth."—pp. ix, x, Preface.

Dr. Davidson has treated of the books of the New Testament in what he deems their true chronological order. As this order, and the particular dates, differ considerably from the tables generally accepted in this country (proceeding from researches made since those tables were formed,) we will briefly state our author's conclusions as to chronology and authorship.

Date.	Book.	Author.
A.D. 52.	2d Thessalonians.	Paul.
53.	1st Thessalonians.	Paul.
57.	1st Corinthians.	Paul.
57.	2d Corinthians.	Paul.
55, 56 or 57.	Galatians.	Paul.
58.	Romans.	Paul.
62.	Philemon.	Paul.
62.	Colossians.	Paul.
62 or 63.	Philippians.	Paul.
66.	Hebrews.	Probably Apollos.
68.	James.	Probably, the James called "the Lord's brother."
69.	Revelation.	John the Apostle, son of Zebedee.
75.	Ephesians.	Perhaps, Paul.
75 to 80.	Peter.	Doubtful.
80.	Jude.	Jude or Judas, not the Apostle.
100 or later.	Matthew.	{ The Aramaean text, from which in part our Greek version of unknown authorship was made, was probably written by Matthew between 66 and 70. Author of Acts of the Apostles, name unknown. Author Jewish, name unknown.
115.	Luke.	Author of Acts of the Apostles, name unknown.
120.	Mark.	Author Jewish, name unknown.
Doubtful.	{ Titus. 2d Timothy. 1st Timothy.	Unknown.
125.	Acts.	Author of Gospel of Luke, name unknown.
130?	1st John.	Doubtful.
131.	{ 2d John. 3d John.	John of Ephesus, not the Apostle.
150.	John's Gospel.	Unknown.
170?	2d Peter.	Unknown.

Of the ideas of the early Christians, in regard to this literature of their faith, Dr. Davidson says :—

"The following propositions are deducible from an impartial survey of the history of the first two centuries.

"1. Before A. D. 170, no book of the New Testament was termed *Scripture*, or believed to be divine and inspired. On the contrary, even after that date, different books were believed to be human compositions, having none other authority than their contents warranted.

"2. No certain trace of the existence of the fourth Gospel can be found till after Justin Martyr, that is, till after the middle of the second century. That Gospel came into use, in the first instance, among the later Gnostics, the followers of Basilides, Valentinus and Marcion, who do not seem to have ascribed it to John. Towards the end of the second century, and not till then, it was assigned to the apostle by fathers of the Catholic Church and by canons. On what ground this opinion rested cannot be ascertained. One thing is clear — that the fathers who believed in its Johannine authorship neither assert nor hint that they relied on historical tradition for their opinion.

"3. The canonical Gospels of Matthew and Mark cannot be identified with the *logia* of Matthew and the things *said and done* by Jesus, which Mark wrote, mentioned by Papias. That writer does not himself identify them. It is also noteworthy that he puts oral tradition above written documents.

"4. The writings of Paul were either not used, or little regarded, by the prominent ecclesiastical writers of the first half of the second century. After A. D. 160 they began to be valued.

"5. The canon, as far as it relates to the four Gospels, was not settled at the close of the first century, as Tischendorf supposes. Not till the latter half of the second century did the present Gospels assume a canonical

position, superseding other works of a similar character and receiving a divine authority.

"6. No canon of the New Testament, i. e., no collection of New Testament literature like the present one, supposed to possess divine authority, existed before A. D. 200."—Vol. II., pp. 520, 1.

It is to be hoped that some publisher will see the advantage of arranging with the author for an American edition of this much needed book. Dr. Davidson, besides competent learning in the various languages and matters connected with the subject, has had the advantage of long familiarity with it, having published a work on the same subject seventeen years ago, some of the conclusions of which have been altered by subsequent study, in the light of modern discovery and criticism.

C. K. W.

THE LIFE OF THE SAVIOUR. H. Ware, Jr. Sixth Edition. Boston: American Unitarian Association.

The fifth edition of this work was issued more than twenty years ago. An "Editorial Note" in the present edition states that "it was at first proposed to have it revised, so that it might be enriched by what later scholarship has contributed towards the better understanding of the Life of Christ." But this was finally decided to be "unnecessary." It was undoubtedly supposed that the modern reader could readily supply those deficiencies which it is intimated "later scholarship" would point out. And when it is remembered that the book is designed especially for Sunday-school libraries, the faith the publishers show in the rising generation appears worthy of all praise. The only amendment which "later scholarship" could possibly offer, would be to substitute for the miraculous theory on which the book is constructed, a rational theory. The grand miracle-play would be given over as "pleasing to the imagination," but having, in point of fact, no basis to rest upon. The author says of "Our Lord's mother," "It is not strange that men have been eager to learn all that concerned her; that in *superstitious* ages they have listened to any tales invented to her honor." The same remark "*later scholarship*" would apply to "Our Lord" himself. And if it should have been permitted to enter into the labors of reconstructing this book, it must have swept it clean of all supernaturalism,—in fact have constructed a new Jesus, or rather, have confessed that there could now be gathered no facts from which to construct one at all.

S. H. M.

A MAN IN EARNEST. LIFE OF A. H. CONANT. By ROBERT COLLYER. Boston: Horace B. Fuller. 1868. pp. 230.

A genial tribute to the memory of Conant,—"a Man in Earnest," a preacher of liberal ideas, a pioneer at the West in '26; a man of truth, well beloved by all. Perhaps it may be said of Conant's whole life that it was "Secular but Sacred." Within the circle of his many friends this book must be very welcome.

S. H. M.